

**Imperial Russia's Multiconfessional Establishment:
The Institutional Domestication of the "Foreign Confessions"**

Paul W. Werth

University of Nevada, Las Vegas^{*}

Towards the end of 1913, thirty-nine members of the State Duma submitted a proposal for the creation of a religious administration for Muslims in the North Caucasus. Unlike the adherents of most other religions and even many Muslims elsewhere in Russia, Muslims of the North Caucasus had no officially recognized religious institutions and clergy. The Duma delegates remarked that this circumstance left those Muslims "in primitive, chaotic conditions" and condemned them "to further vegetation in the darkness of ignorance and religious fanaticism." Given the low economic and cultural level of their mullahs, they had "mastered Islam only in its external form" and remained "completely alien to the spirit and moral truths of the teaching of the prophet Mohammed."¹ Such formulations reveal deep assumptions of the delegates about culture, progress, and proper religion, but in fact the desire for Islam's official institutionalization in the North Caucasus proceeded from Muslims in the region themselves. In 1906 Muslim representatives from the Tersk and Kuban' regions, convened in Vladikavkaz, insisted on the need for such a religious institution. In November of 1913 Chechen representatives had submitted a similar request to the viceroy of the Caucasus. Other Muslims lacking official religious institutions, for example Kazakhs in the steppe, filed similar requests beginning in the 1880s and especially after the revolution of 1905.² In this sense the Duma delegates (three of them Muslims) were giving voice to aspirations for institutional recognition prevalent in Muslim communities.

In essence, these Muslims sought full inclusion in imperial Russia's multiconfessional establishment of religion. It is well-known that Orthodoxy represented the "ruling and predominant" faith of the Russian Empire, but less well-known that virtually all of Russia's other religions and confessions became state institutions as well. Aside from those in a few distant and

^{*} Despite the eternity it has taken me to write this essay, it remains, emphatically, a draft. I therefore invite savage and ruthless criticism.

¹ RGIA, 1276-9-849, ll. 1-3, 10ob. (citations at ll. 2-2ob.); [also addressed in *Mir Islama*, vol. 2, 1913, 915-919 (need to get)].

² S. G. Rybakov, *Ustroistvo i nuzhdy upravleniia dukhovnymi delami musul'man v Rossii* (Petrograd, 1917), 43-55, republished in D. Iu. Arapov, ed., *Islam v Rossiiskoi Imperii: zakonodatel'nye akty, opisaniia, statistika* (Moscow, 2001), 267-315.

recently conquered regions, by the mid-nineteenth century the vast majority of Russian subjects were under the authority of religious bodies that had been created or legitimized by state power and were regulated by imperial statute. Part of a larger study of religious toleration in the Russian empire, this paper sketches out the institution-building and legislative production that created this order, from the publication of the first non-Orthodox statute in 1769 until the amalgamation of a series of similar enactments in the empire's Law Digest in 1857. It was in these years, and especially in the 1820s-40s, that the tsarist government constructed the principal institutional and statutory forms through which it would relate to the empire's culturally diverse populations until the end of the old regime. These laws and institutions defined the basic parameters of religious life in imperial Russia, and it is in this sense that I speak of the domestication of the non-Orthodox religions known as the "foreign confessions."

The broad outlines of the resulting system have been sketched out recently by Robert Crews, who underscores state commitments to the orthodoxy of recognized religions and thus substantial interdependence between religious and state authorities.³ But the process of this order's construction – in particular the legislative dimension – and many of the central principles implicated in it have been addressed only superficially. In the pages that follow I seek to highlight that the particularities of each religious tradition shaped this process of establishment, even as the state sought to invest this emerging religious order with unity and coherence. There was accordingly a substantial tension between the inherited attributes of Russia's diverse religions – their canons, rules, and existing forms of organizations, which were malleable only up to a point – and the standardizing aspirations of a modernizing (if ideologically conservative) state. I furthermore stress that while the creation of this multiconfessional establishment was a process encompassing all of imperial Russia's recognized religions, the institutional and statutory arrangement that took its final form in the 1820s-1850s drew a clear distinction between Orthodoxy and the foreign confessions.

Institutions

For analytical purposes, we may divide the construction of imperial Russia's religious establishment into two distinct but related processes: institution-building and legislating. The

³ Robert Crews, "Empire and the Confessional State: Islam and Religious Politics in Nineteenth-Century Russia," American Historical Review 108.1 (2003): 50-83; on the Catherinian age specifically, see A. S. Riazhev, "Prosveshchennoe dukhovenstvo pri Ekaterine II," Voprosy istorii 9 (2004): 43-57.

model for both lay in the state's management of Russia's "predominant" confession itself – Orthodoxy. In 1721 the Petrine government produced a new Spiritual Regulation that terminated the existence of the Orthodox Patriarch in Russia – the seat had been vacant since the death of Adrian in 1700 – and replaced it with a Spiritual College, known subsequently as the Most Holy Governing Synod. Subsequent decades saw the creation of consistories, collegial bodies comparable to the Synod at the diocesan level, as well as other measures designed to improve and standardize diocesan administration. This new ecclesiastical bureaucracy permitted stricter and more centralized Church control over local religious life, even though a coherent legal basis for its efficient functioning on the diocesan level appeared only with a statute on consistories in 1841.⁴ Historians differ about the degree of independence that the Orthodox Church was able to maintain in this process of bureaucratization. It seems fair to conclude that the Church acquired an absolutized authority over a distinct "spiritual domain," while the Synod nonetheless evolved into a kind of government ministry for the Orthodox religion by the nineteenth century.⁵ Despite its structural and budgetary inadequacies, this evolving system provided a basic model for the state's subsequent efforts to institutionalize the Russia's non-Orthodox religions.

Even so, until the last third of the eighteenth century little was done even in terms of incorporating Russia's largest non-Orthodox religions into the state apparatus. The local administration in the Volga-Ural region began to forge ties with the Muslim scholarly elite (the *ulema*) as early as the 1730s, but these efforts remained provisional and were eclipsed by an aggressive state-directed campaign of Orthodox conversion in the 1740s.⁶ Lutherans, meanwhile, had been permitted to retain their existing religious order, based on the Swedish Lutheran statute of 1686, upon their incorporation into the Russian empire in the early eighteenth century.⁷

⁴ James Cracraft, *The Church Reform of Peter the Great* (New York, 1971); Gregory L. Freeze, *The Russian Levites: Parish Clergy in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1977), 46-77; A. S. Lavrov, *Koldovstvo i religiia v Rossii, 1700-1740 gg.* (Moscow, 2000); Viktor Zhivov, *Iz tserkovnoi istorii vremen Petra Velikogo: issledovaniia i materialy* (Moscow, 2004); T. V. Barsov *O sobranii dukhovnykh zakonov* (St. Petersburg, 1898), 52-65.

⁵ Gregory Freeze, "Institutionalizing Piety,"; Elena Vishlenkova, *Zabotias' o dushakh poddannyykh: religioznia politika v Rossii pervoi chetverti XIX veka* (Saratov, 2002), 169-181 (esp. 174 and 181); A. Iu. Polunov, "Ober-Prokuror sviatseishego sinoda: Osnovnye etapy stanovleniia i razvitiia (XVIII - seredina XIX v.)," IN *ZAIONCHKOVSKII* volume. [get cite].

⁶ Allen J. Frank, *Islamic Historiography*, 26-31; D. D. Azamatov, *Orenburgskoe magometanskoe dukhovnoe sobranie v kontse XVIII - XIX vv.* (Ufa, 1999), 16-20; Paul W. Werth, "Coercion and Conversion: Violence and the Mass Baptism of the Volga Peoples, 1740-1755," in *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 4.3 (2003): 543-569.

⁷ "O Evangelicheskoi-Liuteranskoi tsrkvi v Rossiiskoi Imperii," *Zhurnal MVD*, part 19, section 2 (1856): 45-53 (citation at 46); Vladimir Bashkevich, *Istoricheskii obzor zakonodatel'stva ob ustroistve Evangelicheskoi-*

Several factors combined in the later eighteenth century to place a greater premium on institution-building for the non-Orthodox religions. The acquisition of new territories from Poland rendered imperative the assertion of some state control over the affairs of Roman and Greek Catholics. For several years before the first partition, Catherine II (1762-96) had used the issue of the so-called religious "dissidents" in Poland (Lutherans and Orthodox) for interfering in the internal affairs of that country. This experience attuned the empress to the potential dangers that religious diversity posed for her own country and made her eager, in particular, to block papal pretensions over her new subjects.⁸ Further eastward, uprisings in 1755 and 1773-75, partly in response to the missionary campaigns of the 1740s, convinced imperial officials that an accommodation with Islam was essential. This was all the more desirable after the treaty of Küçük Kanarci of 1774, which recognized some spiritual authority for the Sultan beyond the borders of the Ottoman Empire, most directly over Muslims in Crimea.⁹ Finally, guided by a Polizeistaat models of statecraft and Enlightenment conceptions of religious toleration, Catherine's government came to recognize the utility of non-Orthodox religions as sources for order and stability.¹⁰ In this context it was logical for the state to replicate, with appropriate modifications, the institutional and legal arrangement that had been set in place for Orthodoxy earlier in the century.

Thus after the first Polish partition, Catherine established a bishopric for Russia's new Catholic subjects in 1773, elevating its head to the status of archbishop with jurisdiction over all Catholics in Russia a decade later.¹¹ In 1797 a special department for Catholicism was established, and in 1801 this became the Roman Catholic Spiritual College, a clear analogue to the Orthodox Holy Synod.¹² Innovations were simultaneously being introduced for Islam,

Liuteranskoi tserkvi v Pribaltiiskom krae (St. Petersburg, 1890), 34-37. Similar promises were made to the residents Courland, which was annexed only in 1795. See Bashkevich, Istoricheskii obzor, 40.

⁸ NOSOV article [in Las Vegas]; Larry Wolff, The Vatican and Poland in the Age of the Partitions: Diplomatic and Cultural Encounters at the Warsaw Nunciature (Boulder, Colorado, 1988), esp. ____; Skinner has stuff too.

⁹ D. Iu. Arapov, Sistema gosudarstvennogo regulirovaniia Islama v Rossiiskoi Imperii: Posledniaia tret' XVIII – nachalo XX vv. (Moscow, 2004), 45; Robert Crews, For Prophet and Tsar: Islam and Empire in Russia and Central Asia (Cambridge, Mass., 2006), 39-45.

¹⁰ For a fuller elaboration, see Crews, "Empire."

¹¹ Isabel de Madariaga, Russia in the Age of Catherine the Great (New Haven, 1981), 510-515; Graf D. A. Tolstoi, Rimskii katolitsizm v Rossii (St. Petersburg, 1877), esp. vol. 2; K. Bogoslovskii, Gosudarstvennoe polozhenie Rimsko-katolicheskoi tserkvi v Rossii ot Ekateriny Velikoi do nastoiashchago vremeni (Khar'kov, 1898); Marian Radvan, Katolicheskaia tserkov' nakanune revoliutsii 1917 goda: Sbornik dokumentov (Lublin, 2003), 22-27.

¹² PSZ-I-26-20053 (DATE) (On the restoration of spiritual and ecclesiastical government for the Roman Catholic law in Russia); RGIA, 821-125-41 (Historical sketch of Roman Catholic Spiritual College by A. Mamantov), ll. 14ob., 39.

especially after the annexation of Crimea and Catherine's unilateral repudiation of the sultan's claims of authority over Muslims in Russia. Between 1783 and 1794, the imperial government recognized or established a mufti and a spiritual board in each of the two regions with a substantial Muslim population – Crimea and the Volga-Ural region.¹³ In eastern Siberia regional authorities there invested ever-greater religious power over Buddhist lamas in a single figure, eventually conferring supreme religious authority on a Bandida-Khambo-Lama in 1764 [check date].¹⁴ The Uniate experience was more volatile, but after an aggressive state campaign to "reunite" Greek Catholics with Orthodoxy in the 1790s, the imperial government established a department in the Catholic College for their affairs in 1805 and a new Uniate metropolitanate a year later.¹⁵ Catherine's decision to recognize the religious authority of Armenian Catholicos Simeon, then a subject of Persia [yes?], over Armenians within Russia, subsequently served as the basis for Russian involvement in the selection of Simeon's successors.¹⁶ For Protestants and Jews comparable institutions came a bit later. The government recognized an existing Reformed College in Vil'na for Calvinists in 1831, and the state's effort to create a General Consistory for Lutherans, initiated in 1819, was finally successful in 1832. A centralized Rabbinical Commission did not appear until 1848.¹⁷ Nonetheless, by the early nineteenth century, most of the non-Orthodox confessions had been endowed with religious institutions formally recognized by the state.

Catherine II was clearly the central figure in these developments, but it remains difficult to determine the extent to which these diverse processes were part of a single coordinated policy. There was, for example, no government agency specifically charged with managing the affairs of

¹³ Arapov, Sistema, 44-55; Crews, For Prophet and Tsar, 51-55; Azamatov, Orenburgskoe, __; Iv. Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia Tavricheskago Magometanskago Dukhovnago Pravleniia," in Izvestiia Tavricheskoi Uchenoi Arkhivnoi Kommissii 54 (1918): 316-359; and Kelly O'Neill, "Between Subversion and Submission: The Integration of the Crimean Khanate into the Russian Empire, 1783-1853 (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 2006), esp. 63-78. In the case of Crimea, the government confirmed as mufti a Muslim who already held that position and established a collegial spiritual board in 1794 (though the board began to function properly only in 1831). In the Volga-Ural region the government established the mufti as a new position in 1788 and created the Orenburg Muslim Spiritual Assembly simultaneously.

¹⁴ V. Vashkevich, Lamaity v Vostochnoi Sibiri (St. Petersburg, 1885); and Lamaistvo v Zabaikal'skom krae (n.p., n.d, [before 1900, probably the 1880s]), from the Russian National Library, St. Petersburg.

¹⁵ Ustroistvo Rimsko-Katolicheskoi Tserkvi v Rossii (1867), 30; Radvan, Katolicheskaiia tserkov', 27; Wolff, ARTICLE, 160-64, 186-92; Skinner, "Empress," ____.

¹⁶ G. A. Ezov, "Nachalo snoshenii Echmiadzinskogo patriarshego prestola s russkim pravitel'stvom." appendix to Kavkazskii vestnik, no. 10 (1901): 5-7.

¹⁷ N. Varadinov, Istoriia Ministerstva vnutrennikh del, part 3, book 1 (St. Petersburg, YEAR), 231-32; RGIA, 821-150-616; Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 790-794; PSZ-II-6-4674 (24.06.1831): PAGE; Freeze, Jewish Marriage, 83-87.

the non-Orthodox religions,¹⁸ and in many cases the state seems to have acted in response to specific exigencies or opportunities. Institutionalization of Catholicism and Islam was clearly precipitated by the acquisition of new subjects belonging to those faiths, though in the Volga-Ural region it drew also on patterns of interaction from as early as the 1730s. The impetus for the creation of the Lutheran General Consistory came, in part, from disputes within that religious community caused by the rise of Pietist tendencies that unsettled church traditionalists.¹⁹ Catherine's recognition of the Armenian Catholicos was apparently rooted in the expectation that this would facilitate her country's advances against Muslim powers to the south. But one may nonetheless discern patterns involving state aspirations to enlist non-Orthodox religious elites willing to cooperate with the autocracy; to break religious ties between Russian subjects and coreligionists abroad; to exploit the moral authority of diverse religions for the country's order and stability; and finally to replicate the basic forms of state control over religion already under development for Orthodoxy.²⁰

Changes in the general structure of state administration created new possibilities for the centralized management of religion in the early nineteenth century. In 1808-11 the reformist statesman Mikhail Speransky initiated an extensive rationalization of the state administration by promoting a more logical distribution of administrative functions to different government agencies.²¹ In his "Plan for the General Organization of the Empire" (1809), he proposed the creation of "a separate Department" for religious affairs, since these did not logically fit into any of the spheres of governmental competence that he had identified for existing ministries.²² His thinking here seems to have been inspired by the Napoleonic order, which offered a compelling model of confessional administration that one historian has called "the quadrilateral

¹⁸ The Justice College for Livland, Estland and Finland Affairs did exercise some oversight over certain Christian confessions in Russia's west. It had initially served as an appeals instance for the provinces annexed from Sweden, but its competence later expanded. It soon served as a court of first instance for Protestants not residing in an existing consistorial district, and in 1766 it gained jurisdiction over the affairs of Catholics. RGADA 1274-1-698, ll. 1ob.-2; Vishlenkova, *Zabotias*, 194; Skinner, "Empress and Heretics," 422.

¹⁹ [get citations]

²⁰ Several of these themes are cogently addressed in Crews, "Empire."

²¹ Marc Raeff, *Michael Speransky: Statesman of Imperial Russia, 1772-1839* (The Hague, 1957), 105-117 (esp. 107-09).

²² ORRNB, f. 731, d. 55 (Speransky, *Projet d'organisation generale de l'Empire*, 1809), l. 81ob. This manuscript copy of Speransky's "Plan" (though not in Speransky's own hand) shows the paragraph explaining the need for the Central Directorate precisely as an insertion and moreover one that has no logical place in the enumerated functions of government that the text otherwise provides.

establishment of religion."²³ After the upheavals of the 1790s and an intense struggle to impose the Civil Constitution of the Clergy on Catholic servitors, by the early nineteenth century the French government had come to recognize religion as a source of morality indispensable to good governance. It therefore concluded a Concordat with Rome in 1801, established Catholicism and France's two major Protestant confessions as state religions in 1802, and extended this status to Judaism in 1808.²⁴ To oversee these four (initially three) religions, Napoleon created a Ministry of Creeds, under the direction of J. E. M. Portalis, a negotiator of the Concordat and one of the principal authors of the Civil Code of 1804.²⁵ One should of course be cautious in assessing the degree of Speransky's borrowing from France, since accusations of his enthrallment to Napoleon were central to conservative campaigns leading to his disgrace in 1812.²⁶ But the institutional arrangements that his reform introduced bear striking resemblances to the Napoleonic system, and Portalis' fascinating ideological justification for France's new confessional order presented to the country's legislative body in 1802 could almost just as well have been written for the order that appeared in Russia over the next several decades.²⁷

There was, however, a crucial difference between the French and Russian systems. Under the Napoleonic order, Portalis insisted that France's liberty of conscience proscribed "the idea of a dominant religion," and he pointed precisely to the example of "the Greek religion in Russia" (and also to Catholicism in Poland) as the kind of arrangement that was unacceptable in his own country. Catholicism was professed by members of the government, he acknowledged, but was not the religion of the government; it was the religion of the majority of the people, but not the religion of state. Even as Catholics represented some ninety-eight percent of France's population,

²³ C. T. McIntire, "Changing Religious Establishments and Religious Liberty in France, Part I: 1787-1879," in Freedom and Religion in the Nineteenth Century, ed. Richard Helmstadter (Stanford, 1997), 233-72.

²⁴ On this history, see McIntire, "Changing Religious Establishments," 254-60; Simon Delacroix, La Réorganisation de L'Eglise de France après la Révolution, 1801-1809, tome 1: Les Nominations d'Evêques et la Liquidation du Passé (Paris, 1962), esp. 74-98; and Jean-Michel Leniaud, L'Administration des Cultes pendant la période concordataire (Paris, 1988); André Encrevé, Les protestants en France, 1800-2000 (Toulouse, 2001), esp. 13-17; and Phyllis Cohen Albert, The Modernization of French Jewry: Consistory and Community in the Nineteenth Century (Hanover, New Hampshire, 1977), esp. 45-61.

²⁵ On Portalis, see Delacroix, La Réorganisation, 77-81 and Jean-Luc A Chertier, Portalis, le père du Code civil (Paris, 2004).

²⁶ On caution concerning French influence, see Raeff, Speransky, 55, 156, 158. On the conservative campaign against Speransky, see Andrei Zorin, Zorin, Kormia dvuglavogo orla: Literatura i gosudarstvennaia ideologiya v Rossii v poslednei treti XVIII pervoi treti XIX veka (Moscow, 2001), 187-237.

²⁷ "Discours, Prononcé par le C-en. PORTALIS, orateur de G-ment, dans la séance du Corps législatif du 15 Germinal an 10, sur l'Organisation des Cultes," in Organisation des cultes. Loi, qui ordonne de promulguer et exécuter comme Lois de la République (Paris, 1802). For a brief exegesis of this discourse, see Chartier, Portalis, 263-67.

the Ministry of Creeds incorporated all of France's major religions and offered protection without making any of them "dominant."²⁸ It is possible that Speransky initially envisioned a single department of religion along Napoleonic lines, building on the fact that the Orthodox Holy Synod's chief procurator had already been representing the concerns of non-Orthodox servitors before the Emperor.²⁹ But unlike Catholicism in France, Orthodoxy retained its dominant status, and state was therefore compelled to proceed with greater circumspection. As a contemporary recalled, the creation of a ministry of religious affairs was possible for "the tolerated Christian and non-Christian faiths," but in the case of Orthodoxy, "that would have meant subordinating religious authority to secular too explicitly."³⁰ Thus the Synod was retained for the administration of Orthodoxy, while the religious affairs "of the various other confessions" were now concentrated in a new entity called the Central Directorate for the Spiritual Affairs of Foreign Confessions.³¹ This strict institutional separation between Orthodox and "foreign" remained in effect until 1917 – with one brief deviation.

This deviation served ultimately to solidify Orthodox institutional segregation from Russia's other confessions in the longer term. For a brief period, inspired by a combination of mystical pietism and Christian ecumenism, the government of Alexander I began to construct a ministry of religion encompassing all of Russia's confessions. The man appointed to head the new Directorate in 1810, Alexander Golitsyn, was already chief procurator of the Orthodox Synod, and in 1812 he also became head of the new, ecumenical Russian Bible Society. The Bible Society in turn became part of the Directorate two years later, and a number of officials held positions in both entities. Thus by 1814 virtually all religious affairs in Russia were in fact under the oversight of one person – Golitsyn.³² By 1817, moreover, the Russian system came even closer to approximating its French counterpart. Under the influence of intense mysticism

²⁸ Portalis, "Discours," 27 and 57 (citation at 57).

²⁹ Formally, of course, that position did not invest him with such authority. See Vishlenkova, *Zabotias*, 214-15; and Walter W. Sawatsky, "Prince Alexander N. Golitsyn (1773-1844): Tsarist Minister of Piety" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1976), 209-218. On Speransky's religious thought, which does not seem to have been decisive for his reform proposals, see I. Katetov, "Graf Mikahil Mikhailovich Speranskii, kak religioznyi myslitel'," *Pravoslavnyi sobesednik*, nos. 5-12 (1889).

³⁰ This was Philip Vigel, who worked in the administration of the foreign confessions, as quoted in Vishlenkova, *Zabotias*, 216.

³¹ PSZ-I-31-24307 (25.04.1810): 279-80.

³² Sawatsky, "Prince Alexander Golitsyn," 1-229; Vishlenkova, *Zabotias' o dushakh*, 214-3, 223; Kondakov, 49 [more?]; Nikolai Stelletskii, "Kniaz' A. N. Golitsyn i ego tserkovno-gosudarstvennaia deiatel'nost'," *Trudy Kievskoi Dukhovnoi Akademii*, no. 10 (1899); nos. 3, 7 and 10 (1900); nos. 4, 6, 8 and 9 (1901). Judith Cohen Zacek, "The Russian Bible Society, 1812-1825" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1964).

and ecumenism after the war with Napoleon, Alexander I ordered the incorporation of all educational matters and the affairs of "all confessions" – Orthodoxy included – into a single entity, the so-called Dual Ministry, "so that Christian piety may always be the foundation for true enlightenment."³³ To one historian, the Dual Ministry reflected the principle of "the complete equality of all Christian confessions, not excepting the Orthodox." Another concludes that "the predominance of the Orthodox church was factually abolished."³⁴ Precisely for this reason, however, the arrangement proved unsustainable. The equalization of Orthodoxy with Russia's other religions soon mobilized a conservative Orthodox opposition that eventually destroyed the Dual Ministry and the Bible Society. As the conservative Dmitrii Runich later recalled, "The union of Orthodox administration with the administration of schismatic churches and with Mohammedan and idolatrous beliefs was regarded as a monstrosity offensive to the dignity of the ruling church."³⁵ And as Alexander Shishkov, who would head the Central Directorate in 1824-26, asked rhetorically in a note to the Emperor in 1824, "Is it not strange, dare I say, even amusing to see our Metropolitans and Bishops convening, in violation of Apostolic enactments, in Bible Societies with Lutherans, Catholics, Calvinists, Quakers – in a word with the heterodox of all kinds? With their grey heads and their cassocks and klobuks, they sit together with laymen of all nations, and to them someone in a tail-coat preaches the Word of God."³⁶ In 1824 the Synod was separated from the Dual Ministry, Golitsyn relieved of most of his official duties, and the Bible Society terminated in everything but name.³⁷ This was a crucial moment in Russia's religious history, for the Orthodox Church managed to secure explicit institutional form for its predominant status and to remain – formally, at least – outside of the state's ministerial structures.

³³ PSZ-I-34-27106 (24.10.1817): 814. The Dual Ministry was formally titled the Ministry of Spiritual Affairs and Popular Enlightenment.

³⁴ Stelletskii, "Kniaz' Golitsyn," no. 6 (1901), 194; Iu. E. Kondakov, Dukhovno-religioznaia politika Aleksandra I i russkaia pravoslavnaia oppozitsiia (1801-1825) (St. Petersburg, 1998), 78. See also A. Vasil'ev, "Veroterpimost' v zakonodatel'stve i zhizni v tsarstvovanie imperatora Aleksandra I." Nabliudatel', nos. 6-8 (1896): 35-56, 257-296, 98-113; A. N. Pypin, Religioznye dvizheniia pri Aleksandre I (Petrograd, 1916); Alexander Martin, Romantics, Reformers, Reactionaries: Russian Conservative Thought and Politics in the Reign of Alexander I (DeKalb, 1997), esp. 185-87.

³⁵ Cited in Kondakov, Dukhovno-religioznaia, 78

³⁶ "Zapiski Admirala A. S. Shishkova," in ChOIDR, book 3 (1868): 71-72. Catholics, too, were increasingly uncomfortable with the reigning ecumenism and the downplaying of confessional differences. See Judith Cohen Zacek, "The Russian Bible Society and the Catholic Church," Canadian Slavic Studies 5.1 (1971): 35-50, esp. 42-45.

³⁷ Vishenkova, Zabotias', ____; Sawatsky, "Prince Golitsyn," 404-441; Stelletskii, "Kniaz' Golitsyn," no.18 (1901), 426-59; Zacek, "Russian Bible Society," 249-316; Kondakov, Dukhovno-religioznaia politika, esp. 71-138; Martin, Romantics, 199-200. The Bible Society was formally closed in 1826.

For the moment, the Central Directorate of the Foreign Confessions remained institutionally combined with the ministry of education, and in this sense a modified dual ministry regulating both piety and public enlightenment continued to exist after 1824.³⁸ But the atmosphere in that agency was now quite different. If Golitsyn and his collaborators had played down confessional differences in favor of an "inner church" and had given refuge to sects of various kinds,³⁹ then Shishkov, the new minister of education, insisted on the importance of those differences and came out in strong opposition to sects and schism – among the foreign confessions as well as Orthodoxy.⁴⁰ Nor did even this modified dual ministry last long. In 1826 Dmitrii Bludov was appointed assistant minister to Shishkov, with responsibility for religious affairs, and in 1828 he formally became head of the Central Directorate, now once again an independent ministry.⁴¹ It was probably Bludov's desire to retain control over the important initiatives begun in the 1820s that best explains the Central Directorate's incorporation into the interior ministry when he was appointed to head that unit in 1832.⁴² Thus after a turbulent and confusing initial period, the Central Directorate – now the Department – finally found a permanent home within the interior ministry.⁴³

In its first two decades, the Directorate was concerned above all with regulating Christianity. The very designation "confessions" [*ispovedaniia*] was strictly applicable only to the Christian creeds, and the inclusion of Islam, Judaism and paganism under this rubric betrays their marginal position in the new agency.⁴⁴ In 1829 Bludov's principal assistant, Fillip Vigel', reported that three-quarters of the Directorate's work concerned the affairs of Uniates, Catholics and Armenians. In light of land disputes between the Catholic clergy and landowners, the creation of a separate Uniate Spiritual College in 1828, and the annexation of eastern Armenia the same year, he projected that increases in workload would appear precisely with respect to

³⁸ Vishlenkova, *Zabotias*, 240; PSZ-I-40-30197 (20.01.1825): 34-35. Compared to the robust and insightful literature on the period of the Dual Ministry under Alexander I, the crucial transitional stage to the Nicholaevan religious order is poorly studied and not well documented.

³⁹ Stelletskaia, no. 10 (1900): 291, no. 6 (1901): 186; Kondakov, "Dukhovno-religioznaia politika," 49. [a bit more on "inner church"].

⁴⁰ Kondakov, *Dukhovno-religioznaia*, 192; Sawatsky, "Prince Golitsyn," 453; Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 114.

⁴¹ RGADA, 1274-1-60 and 1274-1-524 (on Bludov's appointments to these positions).

⁴² Both changes occurred in February of 1832. The law authorizing the transfer of the Directorate to the interior ministry provided no indication as to its reasons. PSZ-II-7-5126 (02.02.1832): 53.

⁴³ For a brief time in 1880-1881 the Department once again became an independent institution. See S. A. Adrianov, *Ministerstvo vnutrennikh del: Istoricheskii ocherk* (St. Petersburg, 1911), 111, 170.

⁴⁴ Recall that in France, too, Jews had been made part of the multilateral establishment only several years after the major Christian confessions

these confessions. In contrast, Vigel' foresaw comparatively little work from Muslims and Jews, not least because their religious servitors did not constitute a clerical estate.⁴⁵ This balance of work was partly the result of the Directorate's institutional roots in the Justice College of Livland, Estland and Finland Affairs, which had previously overseen some of the affairs of Catholics and Protestants. The Directorate's staff was thus familiar with those confessions – indeed, some were themselves Catholics and Protestants – while the government had few if any officials with comparable knowledge of Judaism and Islam.⁴⁶ Furthermore, because the ecumenism of the Dual Ministry years was an essentially Christian affair, the "heterodox and Asiatic confessions" remained largely peripheral to the Directorate's core functions.⁴⁷ The Department did take a greater interest in non-Christians in later decades, but the affairs of the Christian confessions took the greatest share of its energies throughout its history.

Even by the time of its inclusion in the interior ministry in 1832, the Directorate could not claim to manage the affairs of all non-Orthodox communities under the Romanov scepter. Its jurisdiction did not yet extend to the Kingdom of Poland – that would occur only in 1871 – and would never formally encompass Finland and Central Asia. In 1856 the Department would even lose direct authority over the religious affairs in the Caucasus to the viceroy there. Furthermore, the affairs of Buddhists came under the Department's purview only in 1834 (for Kalmyks) and 1841 (for Eastern Siberia).⁴⁸ Yet for all these caveats, by 1810 the imperial government had conceptualized Russia's diverse and far-flung non-Orthodox confessions as a coherent collectivity meriting unified administrative oversight.

One fundamental question nonetheless remains: Why were the non-Orthodox confessions designated "foreign"? A few commentators, both inside and outside Russia, criticized this label as being "false" and "completely inappropriate," since the religions in question were indigenous to specific parts of country, and those confessing them were Russian subjects. The French Catholic Marie Joseph d'Horrer furthermore protested the homogenizing character of this

⁴⁵ RGADA, 1274-1-528, ll. 2-7.

⁴⁶ Vishlenkova, *Zabotias*, 181-213, 230. The author of a draft statute for Jews in the first years of the nineteenth century declared it necessary for the government "to examine and investigate what [Jews'] present faith consists of." See Gessen, *Evrei v Rossii*, 49.

⁴⁷ The cited phrase was in the Directorate's draft statute [GARF?]. On this peripheral character, see also Vishenkova, *Zabotias*, 230; and Sawatsky, "Golitsyn," 361-64; and N. Varadinov, *Istoriia Ministerstva vnutrennikh del*, chast' 2, kniga 2 (St. Petersburg, 1862), 602.

⁴⁸ RGIA, 821-150-104 (Historical memorandum of the Department of Foreign Confessions on the administration of religious affairs in the Kingdom of Poland, 1880); PSZ-II-31-30838 (10.08.1856): 682-83; V. Vashekevich, *Lamaity v Vostochnoi Sibiri* (St. Petersburg, 1885), 37, 61; RGIA 821-8-1221.

"artifice of language," because it falsely posited that these religions shared "a common mode of existence."⁴⁹ Within the Central Directorate itself, Vigel' indirectly echoed this critique when he acknowledged in 1829 that Christian clergies were likely to be "offended" if the agency's internal reorganization led to their placement in the same division with non-Christians.⁵⁰

Possibly, this designation was a holdover from an earlier age, when Russia had still not expanded far beyond its Orthodox core, and when many non-Orthodox believers in Russia – especially Christian ones – were indeed foreigners.⁵¹ But generally sources from before the nineteenth century tend either to deploy formulations such as "heterodoxy" [*inoverie*] or "other Christian confessions," or simply to list the confessions in question. In the earliest years of the Directorate, there seems even to have been some discomfort with the designation "foreign." The decree creating the new administration initially labeled it the Central Directorate for Spiritual Affairs of Various Confessions.⁵² Another official in the Directorate, avoiding the term "foreign," referred to it as the "Ministry of Religious Affairs" and even the "Ministry of Heterodox Affairs" [*Ministerstvo Inovercheskikh Del*].⁵³ In the end we may posit that if indeed the French model for Speransky's plan was decisive, then the designation "foreign" may have been adopted primarily in order to block claims to equal treatment of those non-Orthodox confessions that the French model might otherwise have implied. In any event, the term was soon broadly accepted, and in 1868 the interior ministry even referred to Russia's established non-Orthodox confessions – in contrast to newer "sects" like the Baptists – as "indigenous foreign Christian confessions" [*korennyia inostranniaia khristianskii ispovedaniia*].⁵⁴ "Foreign" confessions could apparently become "indigenous," and legal statutes played a crucial role in this domestication.

Statutes

⁴⁹ Marie Joseph d'Horrer, *Persécution et souffrances de l'église catholique en Russie* (Paris, 1842), 28-30 (citation at 28); S. V. Poznyshch, *Religioznyi prestupleniia s tochki zreniia religioznoi svobody* (Moscow, 1906), 218;

⁵⁰ RGADA 1274-1-528 (Memorandum of F. F. Vigel' on the Central Directorate), l. 4ob. Yet Vigel' also noted that these clergies were already united under the Directorate. And he nonetheless proposed placing Armenian religious affairs together with those of non-Christians to create "an Asiatic Department for us, our Eastern Division" (ibid., l. 7).

⁵¹ For a few examples of this designation in the eighteenth century, see PSZ-I-18-13252 (12.02.1769): 838; PSZ-I-21-15356 (28.02.1782): PAGE [in title of law, but not in body]; PSZ-II-5-3796 (15.07.1830): 730 [citation from 1778].

⁵² PSZ-I-31-24307 (25.07.1810): 279 (emphasis added); GARF, f. 1094, op. 2, d. 15, ll. 2ob.-3.

⁵³ RGADA 1274-1-528 (Remarks of G. I. Kartashevskii on the Central Directorate), ll. 8-9, 11-11ob. Kartashevskii was the Directorate's director from 1824 to 1829.

⁵⁴ RGIA 821-5-980, l. 283ob.

Speransky's plan for the reform of state administration was predicated on the observation that the eight ministries created rather hastily in 1802 lacked clear definition of their competence and internal structure. Before his exile to Siberia in 1812, Speransky had only begun to produce a corresponding statute for each ministry, and it appears that for the Central Directorate nothing more than a draft statute was ever produced.⁵⁵ But Speransky's central idea – that institutions could function properly only if their authority and structure had been clearly defined in law – served as a guiding principle for the Directorate/Department as its staff sought to forge functioning relationships with diverse religious institutions and thus to establish some kind of system for the various foreign confessions in the larger imperial order. It was above all in the late 1820s and the 1830s that the Directorate/Department, with input from non-Orthodox religious representatives, produced a series of statutes that would in most cases regulate their affairs of the foreign confessions until the end of the old regime.⁵⁶

The initial steps in this process actually began a good deal earlier. The first enactment of this sort appeared for Catholics in 1769 and was occasioned by complaints of parishioners in St. Petersburg, who sought more control over both the appointment of clergymen and the management of the parish's financial affairs. Although the degree of Catholic participation in the actual formulation of the statute is unclear, the resulting enactment was clearly guided by parishioners' concerns, since it regulated the selection of clergy and established rules for the participation of lay elders in parish governance. It furthermore identified a state institution – the Justice College of Livland, Estland and Finland Affairs – as an appeal instance for disputes between parishioners and their clergy, while insisting that the state had no jurisdiction over issues concerning "the dogmas of faith itself of the Roman confession."⁵⁷ As if to signal its correspondence to the Orthodox Spiritual Regulation of 1721, the empress designated the enactment a "Regulation" (Reglament). The statute was ostensibly granted to the Catholic Church in St. Petersburg, but its inclusion of provisions for the regulation of Catholic affairs in

⁵⁵ V. V. Ivanovskii, Russkoe gosudarstvennoe pravo, 277-332 (esp. 291-305); A. N. Filippov, "Istoricheskii ocherk obrazovaniia ministerstv v Rossii," Zhurnal Ministerstva Iustitsii 10 (1902): 22. An incomplete version of the statute for the Central Directorate, without an indicated author, is in GARF 1094-1-15. It seems probable that the author was either Speransky or Golitsyn (Vishlenkova favors latter, but check).

⁵⁶ For the most part these statutes are not addressed in studies of legal production under Nicholas I, which focus on the larger process of compilation and codification under Speransky. I use the term "statute" here to refer not to laws on individual issues or questions, but on enactments that sought to regulate the affairs of a given confession in a comprehensive fashion.

⁵⁷ Citation at 839 (PSZ no. 13252).

Moscow and in the colonies of the Russian south made it relatively easy to extend its jurisdiction to the territories annexed from Poland a few years later (1772).⁵⁸ Indeed, the statute's appearance was almost surely related to the tumultuous religious situation inside the Commonwealth in the late 1760s.⁵⁹

At the same time, this enactment of 1769 proved far from definitive in the longer term. New provisions designed to establish clear lines of episcopal authority over both parish priests and monastic clergy appeared in 1798.⁶⁰ A statute three years later created the Roman Catholic College, which was originally designed to serve as a "Central Spiritual Consistory" for Catholics, but in fact went on to serve as the principal appeals instance for Catholics.⁶¹ However, to judge by the very large number of individual laws devised to regulate particular aspects of Catholicism in Russia,⁶² the state's approach to Catholicism was a good deal less systematic than it was in the case of other religions. Indeed, the procurator of the College complained in 1840 that "the vagueness of principles and the lack of a code of provisions on the administration of the Roman Catholic clergy" were creating serious discrepancies between Catholic canon and government statutes.⁶³ A degree of codification was attained when St. Petersburg concluded a Concordat with Rome in 1847 and then synthesized those provisions with other existing laws to produce a distinct section on Catholicism in the 1857 edition of the Law Digest.⁶⁴ The Concordat was also one of the few enactments that extended across the internal border between the empire proper and the Kingdom of Poland, where Catholic affairs were otherwise regulated on the basis of a separate decree of 1817.⁶⁵ But because St. Petersburg repudiated the Concordat after the

⁵⁸ PSZ-I-18-13252 (DATE). Regulation granted to the St. Petersburg Roman Catholic church (12 February 1769): 833-40. See also Marian Radwan [Radwan], "Vvedenie," in Radwan, ed. Katolicheskaia tserkov' na kanune revoliutsii 1917 goda (Lublin, 2003), 23; K. Bogoslovskii, Gosudarstvennoe polozhenie Rimsko-katolicheskoi tserkvi v Rossii ot Ekateriny Velikoi do nastoiashchago vremeni (Khar'kov, 1898), 6-11; DeMadariaga, 511.

⁵⁹ This connection needs to be fleshed out fully; Skinner article on Hajamak uprising, etc.

⁶⁰ The enhancement of bishops' authority had also been a prominent feature of Orthodox church reform in the previous decades. See Freeze, Russian Levites, 52-57.

⁶¹ PSZ-I-25-18734 (03.11.1798): PAGE; PSZ-I-26-20053 (DATE.1801): 823-29 (citation at 827); RGIA 821-125-41, ll. 10ob. On the creation of diocese-level consistories for Catholicism and other foreign confessions, see PSZ-I-21-15356 (28.02.1782): 418-19.

⁶² For a large compilation of these laws leading up just to 1824, see Zakonopolozheniia i pravitel'stvennyiia rasporaizheniia do Rimsko-katolicheskoi tserkvi v Rossii otnosiashchiesia so vremeni tsarstvovavniia tsarej Petra i Ioanna Alekseevichei, s 1669 [sic] po 1867 god vkluchitel'no (St. Petersburg, 1868). A planned second volume of this publication covering 1825-67 apparently never appeared.

⁶³ RGADA 1274-1-595, l. 4 (Secret report of procurator of the Roman Catholic College to the interior minister, December 1840).

⁶⁴ Ustroistvo Rimsko-Katolicheskoi Tserkvi v Rossii [composed by the interior ministry] (St. Petersburg, 1867), esp. 12, 43-53. Do I have the Concordat somewhere? GARF, I think. Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): ____.

⁶⁵ RGIA 821-150-104, ll. 1ob.-2, 9.

Polish insurrection of 1863 and issued a series of new, more restrictive decrees in the next several years, legal provisions regulating Catholicism remained poorly systematized until another codification was finally completed in 1893. Even then there remained a basic distinction between the laws of the empire and those of the Kingdom of Poland.⁶⁶ This arrangement – a series of partial, overlapping, and poorly integrated statutes, supplemented by extensive legislation on particular issues – made Catholicism something of an exception in Russia's legal order of confessional administration.⁶⁷

For most confessions the late 1820s proved to be a fundamental watershed on the legislative front. True, there had been some production of draft statutes under Alexander I, but the Napoleonic wars and other distractions prevented their realization.⁶⁸ The dismantling of the Dual Ministry in 1824 and the accession to the throne of Nicholas I a year later gave a new impetus to this legislative production. The process seems to have begun under Shishkov, but it was primarily under Bludov, first as head of the Central Directorate (1826-32) and then as interior minister (1832-39), that an extraordinary wave of legislation on the foreign confessions was undertaken. Thus at some point in the late 1820s the Central Directorate gathered all the material previously produced on Muslim affairs in Crimea earlier the century and produced a new draft statute for the Muslims there that was reviewed by the Muslim Spiritual Board and quickly approved by the Emperor in 1831.⁶⁹ Work on a Lutheran statute, which had stalled in the years of the Dual Ministry, was reactivated in the late 1820s and completed in 1832.⁷⁰ Efforts to organize the religious affairs of Armenians began in Tiflis almost as soon as eastern Armenia was annexed in 1828, and a statute was published in 1836.⁷¹ In 1835 a corresponding enactment was completed for the religious affairs of Jews, which supplemented an earlier statute of 1804

⁶⁶ RGIA 821-150-104, ll. 9ob.-16ob.; RGIA 821-150-81.

⁶⁷ For assessments, see Varadinov, part 3, book 1, 111-112. MORE?

⁶⁸ Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia," 321-335; and RGADA 1274-1-522 and 1274-1-698 (Memoranda of D. N. Bludov on the legislative work for organizing the administration of the Protestant church in Russia). Cite published stuff too.

⁶⁹ Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3 book 1, 405-405; Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia," 336-37. The statute itself is published in *ibid.*, 342-51.

⁷⁰ RGADA 1274-1-698, ll. 15-15ob.; Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 114; Koshelev, *Zapiski*, ____.

⁷¹ RGIA 821-7-1, ll. 309-322 (Bludov's submission of the statute to the State Council for approval, 1835); RGADA 1274-1-723 (memorandum by Bludov on the new statute, 1836), V. G. Tunian, "Polozhenie" Armianskoi tserkvi, 1836-1875 (Erevan, 2001), 19-32; and V. G. Vartanian, Armiansko-Grigorianskaia tserkov' v politike Imperatora Nikolaia I (Rostov-na-Donu, 1999); Shcherbatov on Pashkevich [GET].

that was concerned primarily with Jews' social and legal status.⁷² A statute for Karaites in Crimea and Odessa was published in 1837 and extended to the western province in 1850.⁷³ In 1834 a new statute on Kalmyks, which included a separate section on Buddhist affairs, was published, though this was superseded by a new enactment in 1847.⁷⁴ Work also began in the early 1830s on statutes for Shia Muslims in the South Caucasus and for Buddhists in Eastern Siberia, although those were completed only considerably later.⁷⁵ Thus by the time Bludov left the interior ministry in 1839, most confessions were outfitted with comprehensive legal enactments regulating their religious affairs.

Nor do these statutes represent a full catalogue of Bludov's activity in the management of confessional affairs. It was under his tenure as interior ministry that Mennonites and Buddhists were brought under the Department's jurisdiction,⁷⁶ and together with Uniate Archbishop Iosif Semashko, Bludov played a central role in engineering the "reunion" of Greek Catholics with Orthodoxy in 1839 (and received a gold medal from the emperor in commemoration).⁷⁷ Bludov was also involved in the publication of a new statute on Orthodox consistories, published in 1841, and a new criminal code, with numerous provisions for the protection of religion, in 1845.⁷⁸ Furthermore, Bludov served as the principal negotiator of the Concordat with Rome in 1846-47,⁷⁹ and, as Speransky's successor in the task of legal compilation, he began to incorporate

⁷² Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 115-16, 555; Michael Stanislawski, *Nicholas I and the Jews: The Transformation of Jewish Society in Russia, 1825-1855* (Philadelphia, 1983), 35-42. On the 1804 statute on Jews see Klier, *Russia Gathers*, 116-143; S. Bershadskii, "Polozhenie o evreikh 1804 goda: Opyt istoricheskago izsledovaniia osnovanii i motivov etogo zakonodatel'nago pamiatnika," *Voskhod* (January, March, April and June 1895).

⁷³ PSZ-II-VOLUME-9991 (DATE.1837); Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 2, 255; Miller, *Karaite Separatism*, xv-xvi, 41-49; PSZ-II-25-24634 (13.11.1850): 204.

⁷⁴ *Svod zakonov*, vol. 9 (1842 edition) – presumably?? PSZ no. 21144 (1847); info in 1834??

⁷⁵ Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 558-59 [get stuff on Buddhists still].

⁷⁶ Abraham Friesen, *In Defense of Privilege: Russian Mennonites and the State Before and During World War I* (Winnipeg, 2006), 89. Although Buddhists in Eastern Siberia (mostly Buriats) were brought under the Department's jurisdiction only in 1841, Bludov was nonetheless involved in that process. RGIA 821-8-1221; Vashkevich, *Lamaity*, p. 60;

⁷⁷ Theodore Weeks downplays the initiative of central authorities in this act, but this may merely reflect Bludov's efforts to have the "reunion" appear as a spontaneous process and thus to hide his own efforts. See Weeks, "Between Rome and Tsargrad: The Uniate Church in Imperial Russia," in *Of Religion and Identity*, _____. Bludov's role nonetheless emerges clearly in G. Shavel'skii, *Poslednee vozsoedinenie s pravoslavnoi tserkov'iu uniatov Belorusskoi eparkhii, 1833-39 gg.* (St. Petersburg, 1910) and in RGADA 1274-1-560 (On reunion of the Greco-Uniate church, 1827-1835). On Bludov's receipt of the gold medal, see RGADA 1274-1-69.

⁷⁸ Barsov *O sobranii dukhovnykh zakonov*, 30-65; D. N. Bludov *Obshchaia ob"iasnitel'naia zapiska k projektu Novago ulozheniia o nakazaniakh ugodovnykh i ispravitel'nykh* (St. Petersburg, 1844), 81-2.

⁷⁹ For an extensive account of those negotiations, see A. N. Popov, "Snosheniia Rossii s Rimom s 1845 po 1850 god," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, part 147 (1870): 49-72, 302-344; part 148 (1870): 94-126; part 149 (1870): 1-43, 245-81; and part 150 (1870): 1-38.

legal provisions on the foreign confessions into the Law Digest of the Russian Empire.⁸⁰

Bludov's deep implication in the entire system of imperial Russian confessional administration was understood by the papacy and others, within Russia and without, who were critical of this system.⁸¹ Moreover, when interior minister Petr Valuev proposed granting greater religious toleration to the non-Orthodox religions in 1861, several officials in the Council of Ministers "and in particular Bludov hotly rose up against any change in legislation concerning the foreign confessions."⁸²

Who precisely was Bludov? Born in 1785 in the province of Vladimir, Bludov entered the ministry (initially college) of foreign affairs and served in various capacities in Holland, Sweden, and later England. His career took off in the wake of the Decembrist uprising of 1825, after which Bludov was appointed chief clerk for the commission investigating the noble conspiracy. This task involved passing judgment on several friends and acquaintances from the days of the Arzamas literary circle (1815-18), and Bludov's discomfort with this task be seen in his unusual request not to be present at the actual interrogation of the conspirators. After heading the Central Directorate and then the interior ministry, Bludov served briefly as justice minister (1839) and thereafter as head of the Second Division of the Emperor's chancery and of the State Council's law department (1839-62). It was in this capacity that Bludov continued the compilations begun by Speransky, overseeing work on a series of new codes that lay at the foundation of the judicial reform of 1864, as well as the second and third editions of the Law Digest (1842 and 1857).⁸³

Scholars are generally critical of Bludov, noting his lack of imagination, his relatively limited competence, and a perhaps excessive conformity to the ideological orientations of the three different sovereigns that he served.⁸⁴ Bludov was almost surely the intellectual inferior of Speransky, and there is evidence that he often merely executed propositions formulated by

⁸⁰ P. M. Maikov, Vtoroe Otdelenie Sobstvennoi Ego Imperatorskago Velichestva Kantseliarii, 1826-1882 gg. (St. Petersburg, 1906), esp. 141-42, 277-294.

⁸¹ Popov, "Snosheniia," part 149 (May 1870): 1-3.

⁸² Dnevnik P. A. Valueva, Ministra vnutrennikh del, ed. P. A. Zaionchkovskii, vol. 1 (Moscow, 1961), 136.

⁸³ On Bludov's career, see E. Kovalevskii, Graf Bludov i ego vremia (tsarstvovanie Imperatora Aleksandra I-go) (St. Petersburg, 1866); P. Ivanov, "Graf Dmitrii Nikolaevich Bludov," appendix to Zhurnal Ministerstva iustitsii 19 (1864): 165-80; A. Klimenko, "Master diplomatii," Rossiiskaia iustitsiia 5 (1995): 31-34; and Elena Valer'evna Dolgikh, K probleme mentaliteta rossiiskoi administrativnoi elity pervoi poloviny XIX veka: M. A. Korf, D. N. Bludov (Moscow: Indrik, 2006).

⁸⁴ Klimenko, "Master diplomatii," 34; Wortman, Development, 142-166; and I. V. Ruzhitskaia, Zakonodatel'naia deiatel'nost' Imperatora Nikolaia I (Moscow, 2005), esp. 212-226; Nathans, Beyond the Pale, 56.

others. Nonetheless, at key moments his interventions were decisive. For example, one account relates that only "the strongest pressure" on his part compelled Baltic Lutherans to accept, by a slim majority, the establishment of a single "General Consistory" for all Protestant churches in Russia.⁸⁵ Bludov also exhibited a genuine interest in gathering extensive material about the Armenian church for the formulation of its statute, and by his own account the Department of Foreign Confessions worked on the final draft "almost ceaselessly under the personal supervision of Mr. Minister."⁸⁶ According to one of his subordinates in the Central Directorate, Bludov had a passion for editorial work and "corrected all the papers that came to him for signature to an absurd degree."⁸⁷ Materials on the preparation of the Armenian statute confirm this assessment,⁸⁸ and one may well imagine that his pen was actively deployed in the final redaction of the statutes for the other foreign confessions as well. We also have positive assessments of Bludov's knowledge and skill. Foreign minister Karl Nesselrode praised Bludov for his role in paving the way for negotiations with the Holy See and was pleased when the emperor appointed Bludov the lead negotiator, since "no one is better acquainted with the condition of the Catholic Church in Russia, and no one is better able to explain to the holy throne the essence and goal of certain measures to which we have resorted." Emphasizing the difficult character of the negotiations, Russia's ambassador in Rome later reported, "Count Bludov is conducting the affair splendidly."⁸⁹ Furthermore, if some were later to claim that the Armenian statute had been composed by people "not competent" in such matters,⁹⁰ the government's law department remarked in 1836 that the statute's final draft had been composed by Bludov's interior ministry "with particular assiduity."⁹¹ And when some officials sought to revise the Armenian statute after 1905, the viceroy of the Caucasus defended that legislation as being "penetrated" by tremendous

⁸⁵ Aleksandr I. Koshelev, Zapiski, 1806-1883 (Berlin, 1884 [reprint: Newtonville, Mass., 1976]), 26.

⁸⁶ RGADA 1274-1-723, l. 2ob. (Bludov's report on the new statute for the Armenian church, 1836); SSTsSA 2-1-4679; SSTsSA 11-1-118; SSTsSA 11-1-763.

⁸⁷ Koshelev, Zapiski, pp. 23-24 (citation at p. 23).

⁸⁸ See for example RGADA 1274-1-723, ll. 2-3, where Bludov himself remarks that he made corrections to the Department's draft of the statute. See also Varadinov, Istoriia MVD, part 3, book 1, 660.

⁸⁹ Popov, "Snosheniia," (May 1870): 1, 40.

⁹⁰ GET Ezov's assessment from Oriental Institute. But some of these assessments seem to concern committee in Tiflis (problem of Armenian Catholics) rather than final version. See e.g. Simeonians, 111-113.

⁹¹ RGADA 1274-1-723, ll. 1-3 (citation at 2ob.); RGADA 1274-1-535; RGAI 821-7-1, ll. 325-325ob. (citation); Vartanian, 23-24; Tunian, "Polozhenie" [CHECK TUNIAN'S TAKE ON BLUDOV]; Vartanian, 7-24.

"state wisdom."⁹² Notably, with only two exceptions, the statutes devised by Bludov and his subordinates in the 1820s and 30s remained in force until the end of the old regime.⁹³ In short, if Bludov was perhaps not profoundly skilled and intelligent, it would seem an exaggeration to label him incompetent.

If Bludov's input was decisive, the participation of non-Orthodox representatives in the creation of both institutions and statutes was also crucial. In some cases substantial initiative seems to have come from non-Orthodox believers and/or elites themselves. We have seen how Catholic parishioners in St. Petersburg provided Catherine II with the occasion to publish the first non-Orthodox religious statute in Russia in 1769. A Protestant in state service, Pavian Pezarovius, who proposed the idea of a "State Evangelical Consistory" in 1818, and two pastors asked the emperor to provide the Evangelical church in Russian with "solid organization" in 1827.⁹⁴ Calvinists meanwhile requested state recognition for a Reformed College that could serve as a permanent body between annual meetings of the Lithuanian Synod.⁹⁵ The creation of the statute for Crimean Muslims was in large measure initiated in 1801 by Mufti Seit Megmet, who wrote to Alexander I seeking to establish greater control over the Muslim clergy and to prevent interference of civil authorities in "the Mohammedan religion."⁹⁶ The Karaite statute of 1837 was also provided in response to a request from that community.⁹⁷ These appeals, though by no means universal, show that there was a strong desire within non-Orthodox communities for institutionalization and codification.

Non-Orthodox participation was even more pronounced at the stage of producing draft statutes. The committee that produced the 1801 statute formally creating the Roman Catholic College, for example, was composed of Catholic clergymen and two Catholic senators.⁹⁸ At least some possibility for input was given to Jews – both prominent ones in St. Petersburg and

⁹² RGIA 1276-4-830, l. 52 (Report of the viceroy to the interior minister, January 1908). For details, see Paul W. Werth, "Glava tserkvi, poddannyi imperatora: Armianskii katolikos na perekrestke vnutrennei i vneshnei politiki Rossiiskoi Imperii, 1828-1914," *Ab Imperio* 3 (2006): 99-138.

⁹³ The two exceptions concerned Roman Catholicism (largely as a consequence of the insurrection of 1863) and Karaites (who received a revised statute in 1863 designed primarily to solidify the distinction between them and rabbinical Jews).

⁹⁴ RGADA 1274-1-698, ll. 2-2ob., 15ob.; GARF 1094-2-8, l. 3.

⁹⁵ RGIA 821-150-616, esp. ll. 1-6 (Report of Lithuanian Reformed Synod to head of Central Directorate Bludov, July 1830).

⁹⁶ Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia," 319-320 (citations), 336.

⁹⁷ S. A. Adrianov, *Ministerstvo vnutrennikh del: Istoricheskii ocherk* (St. Petersburg, 1901), 91.

⁹⁸ PSZ no. 20053; A. N. Popov, "Snosheniia Rossii s Rimom s 1845 po 1850 god," *Zhurnal Ministerstva narodnogo prosveshcheniia*, ch. 148, 110. The two senators were counts Severin Potocki and Wielgorski [check Polish spelling].

representatives from local kahals – in the production of the statute of 1804 on Jews.⁹⁹ Lutherans, both pastors and laymen, were the principal participants at various stages of deliberations leading to the statute of 1832.¹⁰⁰ In 1830, the Tauride Muslim Spiritual Board was given the opportunity to comment on the draft of the statute regulating its affairs in 1830.¹⁰¹ In the Armenian case, a committee including three Armenians was constituted in Tiflis in 1829 and composed the initial draft of the statute for the Apostolic Church.¹⁰²

In a number of cases this process of legislative production required the resolution of significant differences within a given non-Orthodox community. Russian Protestants, for example, were gripped by a struggle between pietist and rationalist tendencies that confounded work on a statute in the 1810s and 1820s. Thus while Herrnhutters and other pietists had made considerable inroads among Russian Protestants from the late eighteenth century and in the years of the Bible Society even gained supporters in the court, many Lutherans, and especially the pastorate, strenuously resisted pietist innovations to church practice and accused the pietists of promoting "religious enthusiasm" over "positive dogmatic knowledge."¹⁰³ Protestants were also divided between those favoring a centralized model of church administration, and others – above all Lutherans in the Baltic region, eager to maintain local traditions and practices – who resisted this tendency. Thus some Protestants saw in the creation of an "Evangelical bishopric" in 1819 a government effort to introduce an alien hierarchical organization and eventually to alter the Augsburg confession itself. This reaction compelled the government to limit the bishop's jurisdiction to the St. Petersburg consistorial district and also to pay greater attention to the perspectives of "the Protestant provinces" (the Baltic region), whose representatives continued to resist the idea of both a bishop and an authoritative general consistory.¹⁰⁴ Together with certain Lutheran pastors, Bludov identified a return to Lutheran roots as an antidote to the twin dangers of the "religious delusions" caused by pietist enthusiasm and the "atheism" [neverie] that

⁹⁹ Klier, Russia Gathers Her Jews, 124-127. Read also Bershadskii on 1804. I have little info on production of the 1835 statute.

¹⁰⁰ Koshelev, Zapiski, 25-26; RGADA, f. 1274, d. 522 and 698 (Bludov's reports concerning work on rules for Protestantism). For Alexander Turgenev's critical reaction to early drafts of the statute creating the General Consistory, see GARF 1094-2-8.

¹⁰¹ Aleksandrov, "K istorii," 337; Varadinov, Istoriia MVD, part 3, book 1 (St. Petersburg, 1862), 404-05;

¹⁰² V. G. Vartanian, Armiansko-Grigorianskaia tserkov' v politike Imperatora Nikolaia I (Rostov-na-Donu, 1999); V. G. Tunian, "Polozhenie" Armianskoi tserkvi, 1836-1875 (Eerevan, 2001). A. Simeon'iants, "Iz istorii Armianskoi tserkvi," in Armianskii sbornik, second edition (Moscow, 1915): 93-127, esp. pp. 111-113.

¹⁰³ RGADA 1274-1-522, l. 3ob. (citation); Sawatsky, "Prince Golitsyn," 337-61; Vishlenkova, ____ [more?].

¹⁰⁴ GARF 1094-2-8, l. 9; RGADA 1274-1-698, ll. 7ob.-8ob., 13. That bishop, Zachris Cygnaeus, died in 1830 and [apparently] was not replaced. [Did he serve as bishop all the way until death?]

seemed the inevitable consequence of excessive rationalism. Moreover, while respecting local practices and institutions, the Central Directorate under Bludov nonetheless promoted "unity" and consistency in the administration of the Lutheran confession and therefore insisted – in the face of considerable resistance – on a centralized consistory properly subordinated to the Central Directorate.¹⁰⁵ Thus the 1832 statute included important devices to protect Lutheran orthodoxy and granted considerable supervisory powers to the General Consistory.¹⁰⁶

The production of the Armenian statute likewise demonstrates a reconciliation of different perspectives. One of the most striking features of the "secret" committee convened in Tiflis to compose its first draft were the Catholic orientations of its four members. Most notably, the principal author of the draft, Jacques Chahan de Cirbied, was a native of the Ottoman Armenia who had entered Catholic orders in Rome in 1789, became a specialist of Armenian literature in Napoleonic France, and came to Russia in 1826 to help found an Armenian publishing house.¹⁰⁷ Apparently sensing the inadequacy of the draft produced by this strange contingent, Bludov sought out other knowledgeable Armenians, who could provide more information unofficially about the legal provisions of their church.¹⁰⁸ The resulting input provided by Khristofor Lazarev, a prominent merchant and founder of an institute for "eastern" languages in Moscow, and Alexander Khudobashev, a translator in the foreign ministry, seems to have been important in getting the government to recognize the religious authority of the Catholicos as ecumenical.¹⁰⁹ On the whole, revisions to the Tiflis draft made in St. Petersburg were substantial, though it is hard to say which of these depended on these alternative Armenian outlooks, and which on Bludov and his associates. It seems safe to conclude, however, that the imperial government had to make distinct choices about which perspectives on the church corresponded best to its interests and (its perception of) the traditions of the Apostolic confession.

¹⁰⁵ RGADA 1274-1-522 (citations at 6ob.); RGADA 1274-1-698, ll. 16ob.-18. On resistance, see Koshelev, Zapiski,

¹⁰⁶ PSZ-II-VOLUME-5870 (28.12.1832), sections 1-5, 318 (Svod zakonov 11-1 [1857]: 134-138, 460).

¹⁰⁷ On the strange composition of the committee, see Simeonians, 111-113; Tunian "Polozhenie" Armianskoi tserkvi, ____; Vartanian, Armiano-grigorianskaia tserkov'; 10-11. Tunian does note that future Catholicos Ioannes did also participate some in an informal capacity (9).

¹⁰⁸ This was the subject of Bludov's letter to the head of the Third Division A. Kh. Benkendorf in May of 1830, in RGADA 1274-1-535, ll. 1-3.

¹⁰⁹ The role of Lazarev and Khudobashev, largely obscured by Bludov's insistence on "unofficial and secret means" for Armenian participation at that stage of the deliberations, emerges clearly in the account provided by Tunian, 13, 25-26, 49-50.

It is worth emphasizing the extent to which the imperial government sought to root each statute in the teachings, traditions, and the canons of the confession in question. Thus the Emperor instructed that the statute for the Armenian church be based "on its own ancient ordinances" and then be "brought into conformity with the legal provisions of the Russian Empire."¹¹⁰ Bludov accordingly prepared a list of some eighty-five specific questions about the Armenian church for the Tiflis committee, and his subordinates gathered "a rather enormous quantity of excerpts" from sundry government papers and "from various more or less well-known compositions from Armenia." Bludov supplemented this, as we have seen, with information from other Armenians through confidential channels.¹¹¹ In presenting the final draft to the State Council, Bludov remarked that "ancient laws, customs, and traditions" served as crucial sources for its completion in St. Petersburg.¹¹² This tendency was even more pronounced in the case of Protestantism. Shishkov insisted that "only true Lutheran rules and institutions" could restore order in that church, and Bludov concurred that assessments needed to be free "from all opinions, instilled by the passions and prejudices of [different] parties." Based on this view, and taking the Swedish church statute of 1686 as the basic standard, the Emperor instructed consistories in the Baltic provinces to collect "the truest and most thorough information" about all deviations from that statute that had occurred over time and due to local custom. He added that the committee producing the final draft should make every effort to ensure that all new provisions "are precisely in accord with the fundamental laws of the Protestant Evangelical church, not only with respect to the dogmas of the faith in all their integrity and inviolability, but also in the most important principles of ecclesiastical administration, and in the very rules defining the most important rituals of the church service."¹¹³ Even in the case of Catholicism, the government's desire to maximize the scope of Catholic canon – within the parameters established by imperial law – is discernable. Thus Nesselrode wrote with satisfaction to the ambassador in Rome that almost all of the members of the

¹¹⁰ RGADA 1274-1-723, l. 1ob. See also Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 287, 660.

¹¹¹ RGADA 1274-1-535 (citations at l. 1). That inquiry included sixteen specific questions on a fairly wide range of issues. On the eighty-five questions submitted to Tiflis: SSC'SA 2-2-1832 (I was not yet able to consult this file).

¹¹² RGIA 821-7-1, ll. 317ob.-319ob. (citation at l. 317ob.).

¹¹³ RGADA 1274-1-527, l. 9. See also Varadinov, *Istoriia MVD*, part 3, book 1, 231-33.

committee preparing for negotiations with the papacy in 1846-47 "recognized the necessity of altering existing statutes in order to bring them into agreement with canonical laws."¹¹⁴

How are we to understand this concern for respecting – and even compiling – the provisions of "foreign confessions" in Russia? Part of the answer should be sought in the main ideological trends of the first decade of Nikolaevan Russia, and in particular to education minister Sergei Uvarov's famous triad Orthodoxy–Autocracy–Nationality. Andrei Zorin has emphasized that despite the ostensible prominence of Orthodoxy in this formulation, Uvarov in fact exhibited an "obvious confessional indifference" and was ultimately concerned with religion not in terms of its dogmatic truth, "but in light of its traditional character." As Zorin concludes, "It is clear that for Uvarov it was all the same which church and faith were under discussion, as long as they were implanted in the history of the people and the political structure of the state."¹¹⁵ There could be little doubt that the foreign confessions were "implanted in the history" of their respective peoples, as in most cases those populations had been practicing those religions for centuries prior to their incorporation into the tsarist empire. The burst of institution-building and legislation in the 1820s and 1830s should therefore be regarded as an effort on the part of the imperial government and also many non-Orthodox believers to "implant" the foreign confessions in the structure of the state as well. Robert Crews similarly insists that the tsarist regime sought to ground imperial authority in religion, and this in turn compelled the state to become a patron of "orthodoxy" for each recognized religious community. Such a program of promoting religious conformity could be based only on some concrete notion of what this "orthodoxy" actually entailed in each specific case.¹¹⁶ "Orthodoxy" could be defined by accepting the judgments of particular religious elites or by authorizing compilations of existing canons and traditions. The imperial government deployed both methods in its legislative efforts.

We must also take note of new political meanings that were being ascribed at this time to the act of compilation. Tat'iana Borisova has shown that in the 1810s and 20s Russians began to make a basic distinction between two kinds of codification: one kind (ulozhenie) implied reformist and pro-European tendencies, while another (svod) implied a national and conservative orientation that stressed the indigenous (samobytnyi) character of the legislation being

¹¹⁴ Cited in Popov, "Snosheniia," part 149 (May 1870): 1. It was here that Nesselrode singled out Bludov for particular praise in attaining this result.

¹¹⁵ Zorin, Kormia dvuglavogo orla, 360.

¹¹⁶ Crews, "Empire and the Confessional State," esp. ____.

rationalized. Thus while ulozhenie came to imply foreign models and importation, svod signified a rationalization of one's own existing enactments – "a new, national approach to codification." Even Speransky, who had composed a civil ulozhenie in 1809, adopted this outlook upon his return to legislative work in 1826, and he himself described his crowning achievements, the Complete Collection of the Laws and the Law Digest, respectively, as "a historical svod" and a "svod of existing laws."¹¹⁷ The effort to collect the "ancient laws, customs, and traditions" of the Protestant and Armenian confessions, which was occurring at exactly the same time as Speransky's svod-making, should surely be seen as part of this same process. It seems hardly coincidental that Bludov insisted in 1827 on the necessity of "a svod of Protestant Church laws" prior to the creation of the statute for that confession.¹¹⁸ This process admittedly involved the use of foreign models – most notably Swedish church enactments of the seventeenth century and the 1828 edition of the Prussian church statute – but this was entirely logical in terms of the historical trajectory of most Protestant communities in Russia.¹¹⁹ Most had, after all, been under Swedish rule in the seventeenth century, and there simply were no Russian legal traditions on which to construct an ecclesiastical administration for Protestants.¹²⁰ Though Bludov did not use the word svod to describe his investigations on behalf of the Armenian church, his efforts to rationalize its existing enactments and traditions were clearly guided by this same spirit. Significantly, a similar process occurred with respect to Orthodoxy itself beginning in 1835.¹²¹

Such efforts were admittedly much more modest in the case of the other confessions. The "ancient laws, customs, and traditions" of the Catholic Church were maintained by Rome, and the corresponding effort to "implant" that confession in the structure of the Russian state took the form of a diplomatic agreement with the Holy See – the Concordat of 1847. No compilation was

¹¹⁷ Tat'iana Iu. Borisova, "Bor'ba za russkoe 'natsional'snoe' pravo v pervoi chetverti XIX veka: izobretenie novykh smyslov starykh slov," in Istoricheskiye poniatiia i politicheskie idei v Rossii XVI–XX veka: Sbornik nauchnykh rabot, (St. Petersburg, 2006): 123-151 (citations at 128 and 144).

¹¹⁸ RGADA 1274-1-522, l. 6ob.

¹¹⁹ Varadinov, Istoriia MVD, part 3, book 1, 114; RGADA 1274-1-698, l. 15-15ob.; RGADA 1274-1-522, l. 6ob.; RGADA 1274-1-527, l. 5ob. A Prussian representative was invited to aid in the preparation of the Russian statute. The 1853 statute on Buddhism also drew on a Chinese counterpart published in 1817. See Vashkevich, Lamaity, 69-70.

¹²⁰ The Swedish statute was also notable for the authority that it granted to royal power – something that pastors had resisted – and the imperial government's desire to identify deviations from the statute were presumably also rooted in this circumstance. On royal authority in the Swedish statute, see Bashkevich, Istoricheskii obzor, 27.

¹²¹ Maikov, O svede zakonov, 74-75. [BARSOV??] This effort led to the publication, only much later, of Polnoe sobranie postanovlenii i raspriazhenii po vedomstvu pravoslavnago ispovedaniia Rossiiskoi Imperii.

undertaken for Greek Catholicism for this same reason, and also because by 1828 the government had resolved to promote the "reunion" of Uniates with Orthodoxy and therefore had no interest in fortifying that confession with compilations of its "ancient laws, customs, and traditions." As concerns the non-Christian religions, the relative absence of compilation was the consequence of both the absence of religious hierarchy and codified doctrine, on the one hand, and probably the simple lack of expertise in the imperial government, on the other.¹²² Even this, however, did not prevent the government from eventually publishing statutes for Muslims in Crimea, Karaites, Jews, and Buddhists.

In fact, Bludov eventually applied the idea of svod to the foreign confessions on a grander scale, by incorporating (almost) all of the enactments discussed here into a single volume, entitled "Statutes of the Religious Affairs of the Foreign Confessions," of the Law Digest's third edition in 1857.¹²³ With this publication, the main work of codification for the foreign confessions was complete. Notably, this compilation further solidified the division of the spiritual domain into Orthodox and non-Orthodox components. Neither the 1721 Spiritual Regulation nor the 1841 statute on Orthodox consistories was included in the Digest, even though these enactments were cut from the same cloth as the statutes on the foreign confessions. Orthodoxy therefore remained distinct in statutory, as well as institutional terms.

The Structures and Character of Religious Authority

It remains for us to identify the fundamental principles that informed the institutions and statutes we have considered here. These arrangements were too diverse to submit to grand generalization and are perhaps best approached by considering a series of oppositions, with each confession occupying a particular place on the continuum between two poles. Those oppositions include:

¹²² The absence of a clergy and clearly defined rituals in services led the committee reviewing the draft of the Jewish statute of 1835 to avoid "excessively definitive enactments for them." Cited in Varadinov, Istoriia MVD, part 3, book 1, 555. Notably in 1798 there was no one in St. Petersburg who could translate a denunciation submitted by one group of Jews against another. It had to be sent to Vilnius for translation. See Iu. I. Gessen, Evrei v Rossii: Ocherki obshchestvennoi, pravovoi i ekonomicheskoi zhizni russkikh evreev (St. Petersburg, 1906), 161-2.

¹²³ The 1842 edition included provisions regulating the status of non-Orthodox Christian clergies (vol. 9, arts. 321-457), but only the 1857 edition contained a volume entitled (vol. 11, part 1). For reasons that are not entirely clear, but that depended on the will of Nicholas I, the statute on Buddhism in Eastern Siberia was included in neither the 1857 nor the 1896 edition of this volume. RGIA 821-150-423, l. 1. The 1853 statute itself is on ll. 1-8, and also in Vashkevich, Lamaity, 127-37. Svod zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii, vol. 11, part 1 (1857 ed.), articles 1260-1284 (on Kalmyks) and articles 1285-1286 (on Buriats). A general outline of the Digest's production over several editions is provided by in P. M. Maikov, O svode zakonov Rossiiskoi Imperii (St. Petersburg, 1906), 102-172.

tradition vs. innovation; centralization vs. territorial fragmentation; monocratic [edinolichnaia] authority vs. the collegial principle; and election vs. appointment.

Despite an abiding and genuine concern with "ancient laws, customs, and traditions," the process we have described involved substantial innovation. If the Armenian Catholicos and the mufti in Crimea were inherited positions now molded by imperial statute and practice in order to better serve the state, then institutions like the Orenburg Muslim Assembly and the General Evangelical-Lutheran Consistory were essentially new – and they encountered at least some resistance as a consequence. The Bandida-Khambo-Lama for Siberian Buddhists, meanwhile, represented the deployment of indigenous religious conceptions in new ways, thus combining elements of the old and the new.¹²⁴ Finally, the Roman Catholic College represented a sufficiently great departure from Catholic practice that Rome recognized it only when it had essentially been stripped of all spiritual authority.¹²⁵ The broad novelty of these institutions resides in the fact that their functions and competence were defined in new ways and that their authority was now rooted in imperial decree and statute. Yet important limits on innovation need also to be recognized. One informed official noted in 1849 that whereas the distance of Crimean Muslims from Islamic states made them more willing to accept innovations promoted by the state, Muslims in the South Caucasus had frequent contact with Turkey and Persia, as a result of which "each new directive of the government is compared with the static character [nepodvizhnost'] of the order there [across the border], and even well-intentioned state initiatives are received with grumbles of dissatisfaction."¹²⁶

There were also considerable limits on the state's efforts to establish autocephaly within Russia for each of its confessions (however "foreign" they might be).¹²⁷ New centers of Islamic, Buddhist, Protestant, and Karaite religious authority minimized cross-border connections, but these were by no means eliminated entirely.¹²⁸ In two cases – Catholicism and the Armenian

¹²⁴ The term Bandida (also Pandita) is a Sanskrit term signifying someone with great knowledge. Khambo and Lama are Tibetan words signifying "religious teacher" and pertained only to religious figures within their monasteries. See Vashkevich, Lamaity, 28; and Institut Bandida Khambo-Lamy u buriat v ego otnoshenii k lamaizmu i missii (Kazan', 1911), 2.

¹²⁵ RGIA 821-125-41, esp. ll. 37ob.-44; RGIA 821-150-104, ll. 17-17ob.

¹²⁶ "Ob"iasnitel'naia zapiska proekty N. V. Khanykova," in Kolonial'naia politika Rossiiskogo tsarizma v Azerbaidzhane v 20–60-kh gg. XIX veka (Moscow & Leningrad, 1937), 377.

¹²⁷ On this aspiration, see Crews, "Empire and Confessional State," ____.

¹²⁸ In some cases the state was even eager to exploit cross-border religious ties for its own benefit. See Eileen M. Kane, "Pilgrims, Holy Places, and the Multi-Confessional Empire: Russian Policy Toward the Ottoman Empire under Tsar Nicholas I, 1825-1855" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 2005).

confession – religious authority did not stop at Russia's borders. Catherine II did strive to maximize the authority of Catholic Archbishop and Metropolitan Stanislaus Siestrenciewicz-Bohusz, and the committee that created the College in 1801 sought to create an administration of Catholic affairs "without the influence of any alien power."¹²⁹ St. Petersburg eventually succeeded in terminating the Pope's power over Uniates through their "reunion" with Orthodoxy. But in the case of Roman Catholics, the state proved incapable of replacing papal authority entirely. Thus even after the government repudiated the Concordat in 1866, soon growing numbers of episcopal vacancies ultimately drove it to seek accommodation with Rome once again in the 1870s and 80s; there simply was no mechanism to consecrate legitimate Catholic bishops in Russia without the Holy See.¹³⁰ If the goal of Catholic autocephaly was compromised by the spiritual authority of a foreign subject projected inward, then the power of the Armenian Catholicos at the head of the Apostolic Church offered Russia the opposite: a Russian subject with spiritual authority extending outward, beyond the borders of the empire. This arrangement offered St. Petersburg the possibility – or at least the hope – of exploiting the Catholicos as an instrument in its foreign policy.¹³¹ Curiously, in 1858 an imperial official proposed establishing a similar arrangement for Jews – i.e., "a kind of Jewish papacy" [*une espèce de papauté israélite*] designed to attract the allegiances of Jews throughout the world – but this idea was rejected in 1860 because "the hierarchical principle" was simply alien to Judaism.¹³² In short, the character of religious authority in each religion defined the possibilities both for autocephaly within Russia and for the use of religious institutions in the projection of Russian imperial power across the empire's borders.

Within Russia itself, the jurisdiction of confessional institutions and statutes varied considerably. At one end, the jurisdiction of the Orthodox Synod and the Armenian Catholicos extended across the entire empire, without regard to internal administrative divisions. For most other confessions, there was a fundamental distinction between the Kingdom of Poland and the empire proper. Thus the authority of the "Metropolitan of all Catholics" was restricted to dioceses in the empire, while a separate Metropolitan oversaw affairs in the kingdom until the

¹²⁹ PSZ, first series, vol. 26, no. 20053 (13 November 1801): 823. Perhaps a note on Siestrenciewicz here.

¹³⁰ Need to fill in with sources and lit. Nor did the government act on a curious proposal in 1866 for the creation of Catholic hierarchy in Russia independent of Rome. On the proposal, see GARF 109-2-712 (sekretnyi arkhiv).

¹³¹ Werth, "Glava tserkvi."

¹³² RGIA, f. 821, op. 8, d. 507 (On the memorandum of tajnyi sovetnik Rikhter on the creation of a central religious authority for Jews, 1858-60), citations at ll. 2 and 8ob. Bludov, incidentally, was head of the Jewish Committee at this point and presented his colleagues' rejection of the idea to the Emperor.

elimination of that post in 1867 [yes?]. The government's efforts to extend the authority of the Roman Catholic College over the kingdom beginning in the 1860s were resisted by Rome and Polish bishops until the government agreed to deprive that institution of all but its essentially economic functions.¹³³ This distinction affected also Jews and Protestants, who had separate enactments in Poland, and it was crucial for Uniates, whose "reunion" in the kingdom occurred much later and involved greater coercion.¹³⁴ Even after the kingdom came under the jurisdiction of the Department of Foreign Confessions in 1871, there remained a fundamental distinction between the enactments for the kingdom and the empire. Thus the 1896 edition of Law Digest's volume 11 upheld a clear distinction between the laws of one and the other, even a sit included all of them within its covers (for the first time). Heavily Lutheran Finland remained even more distinct, and as far as I know the Department's jurisdiction never extended to that territory.¹³⁵

If in the case of Christian confessions the state generally sought to unite religious affairs under a single institution, in the case of the non-Christian religions that tendency was much weaker. In the case of Jews, admittedly, there was some effort at centralization in the form of the Rabbinical Commission. But that body convened only intermittently – only six times over seventy years –and could therefore scarcely direct Jewish affairs in a highly organized fashion. Even a proposal in 1840 to establish provincial rabbis with supervision over their peers had no results.¹³⁶ For Buddhists a basic distinction was drawn between Kalmyks and Buriats, each with its own spiritual head and statute. Given the distance between these two populations, this distinction can be understood as involving a combination of geography, way of life, and ethnicity. Yet greater fragmentation was introduced in the later years of tsarism. In order to prevent the consolidation of Buddhism among those Buriats deemed most amenable to Orthodox conversion, the government excluded the Buddhists of Irkutsk province, to the west of Lake Baikal, from the jurisdiction of the Bandido-Khambo-Lama in 1889 and established distinct

¹³³ RGIA, f. 821, op. 150, d. 104, ll. 17-17ob.

¹³⁴ [GET LIT on Uniates here]. Stanislawski, Tsar Nicholas I, 196 (n. 5); In the case of Jews, even the 1896 edition of vol. 11 did not incorporate provisions for Jews in the kingdom, but merely referred to the most important enactments in question. See Svod zakonov, vol. 11, part 1, art. 1299, annotation no. 3. A series of specific articles of the 1832 Lutheran statute (for the empire) were declared to be valid for the Kingdom in the 1896 edition of vol. 11, part 1 of Svod zakonov, art. 899. Amburger, Geschichte, 77.

¹³⁵ On Finland, where a Protestant statute appeared in 1869) see Bobylev, "Istoriia i pravovoe polozhenie," 49.

¹³⁶ PSZ-II-23-22276 (24.06.1848): 346-47; Freeze, Jewish Marriage, 83-95, 245-56; Iu. Gessen, "Ravvinat v Rossii," Evreiskaia entsiklopediia, vol. 13 (1912?): 227. The Rabbinical Commission met in 1852, 1857, 1861-62, 1879, 1893-94, and 1910.

rules for their religious governance.¹³⁷ For Muslims, too, territorial distinctions were crucial. The Orenburg Assembly was initially established for all of the empire's Muslims, but from the very beginning an exception was made for Crimea. When the mufti of Orenburg proposed the creation of a central college for Muslim affairs in St. Petersburg in 1804 – presumably on the model of the Roman Catholic College – this idea was rejected.¹³⁸ Subsequently acquired territories were left beyond of the jurisdiction of the Orenburg Assembly, and in 1868 the steppe region was even removed from its authority for reasons analogous to those in the case of Irkutsk Buriats.¹³⁹ The state furthermore created separate institutional and statutory arrangements for Shias and Sunnis in the South Caucasus.¹⁴⁰ The administration of Muslims was accordingly fractured throughout different parts of the empire, and across the nineteenth century the state expressed growing opposition to any further centralization in this regard. Indeed, government plans for reform of the Muslim administration almost always promoted further fragmentation, even as Muslims themselves usually proposed greater unity and integration.¹⁴¹

The structures of religious authority created by imperial statutes generally embraced the collegial principle, which was at the foundation of the Orthodox Holy Synod, originally known as the "Spiritual College." The first part of the 1721 Spiritual Regulation was in fact devoted precisely to demonstrating why a "permanent conciliar administration" was "more adequate and better than an administration by a single individual, the more so in a monarchy." A college was better at uncovering truth, less susceptible to "partiality" and "corrupt judgment," and less likely to challenge the authority of the sovereign.¹⁴² Under Peter the Great the collegial principle was in fact applied to essentially all institutions of government, although some have argued that collegial structures masked a monocratic exercise of authority by the chairman of each college.¹⁴³ With the creation and reform of the ministries in 1802-1811, the collegial pattern was formally swept away, although collegial elements persisted within the ministerial system and

¹³⁷ Schorkowitz, 207. Details, and the new rules on the cis-Baikal territory that superceded the 1853 statute are in RGIA 821-150-423, ll. 21-25.

¹³⁸ Azamatov, *Orenburgskoe*, 31-32.

¹³⁹ Crews, *For Prophet and Tsar*, 53, 226. [MORE?].

¹⁴⁰ On the importance of this distinction to tsarist administrators, see *Kolonial'naia politika*, 283, 396.

¹⁴¹ RGIA 1276-2-593, ll. 107-115ob.; Arapov, *Sistema*, ____; Diliara Usmanova [in French volume].

¹⁴² Alexander V. Muller, trans. and ed., *The Spiritual Regulation of Peter the Great* (Seattle, 1972), 8-12.

¹⁴³ See, most recently, L. F. Pizar'kova, *Gosudarstvennoe upravlenie Rossii s kontsa XVII do kontsa XVIII veka* (Moscow, 2007), PAGE.

even made something of an informal comeback by the end of the nineteenth century.¹⁴⁴ In the longer term, the Holy Synod itself reflected these tensions between collegial and monocratic principles. On the one hand, the growing authority of its chief procurator, especially after the dismantling of the Dual Ministry, "transformed the Orthodox college into one of the empire's ministries."¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, in contrast to government ministries the Synod retained its formally collegial structure, and despite his considerable powers the chief procurator was not actually a member of the Synod and may therefore not be regarded simply as its master.¹⁴⁶

Whereas the Orthodox Holy Synod had replaced a Patriarch in 1721, most foreign confessions either retained or acquired a religious head with monocratic attributes. Thus St. Petersburg not only proved unable to terminate the authority of the Pope over Russian Catholics, but also granted religious power within the empire to a single archbishop (later metropolitan) in 1783.¹⁴⁷ Likewise, the government readily invested extensive powers in the Armenian Catholicos and defined as "spiritual heads" [dukhovnyia glavy] three Islamic muftis, one sheyh ul-Islam, a Bandido-Khambo-Lama and a senior lama for Buddhists, and a hakham for the Karaites.¹⁴⁸ Protestantism and Judaism were exceptions in this regard. An attempt to establish a bishop for Russia's Protestants met with resistance, while the absence of hierarchy in Judaism prevented the creation of a comparable figure for Jews. But otherwise the desire to have a single figure through whom religious affairs for each faith could be directed, as well as the impossibility in some cases of depriving existing religious heads of authority firmly rooted in canon and tradition, provided a considerable foundation for the monocratic principle.

It was at the same time obvious to imperial officials that this monocratic authority needed to be contained, and three principal institutions – collegial bodies, procurators, and an appeals process – were devised to perform this function. Thus the Catholic statute of 1801 emphasized that bishops and consistories would be subordinate not to Metropolitan Sestrenciewicz, but to the College. And whereas Sestrenciewicz would serve as president of the College and cast the

¹⁴⁴ Raeff, Michael Speransky, 111; Ivanovskii, Russkoe gosudarstvennoe pravo, 284-332; and idem, "Kollegial'noe nachalo v ministerstvoi organizatsii," Zhurnal Iuridicheskago obshchestva Imperatorskago Sankt-Peterburgskago Universiteta, book 7 (Septmber 1895): 1-28.

¹⁴⁵ Vishlenkova, Zabotias' o dushakh, 181 and 243 (citation). Polunov is in broad agreement, dating the completion of this process to the mid-1830s. [get article].

¹⁴⁶ Ivanovskii, Russkoe gosudarstvennoe pravo, 273-75.

¹⁴⁷ The same was done for the Kingdom of Poland in 1817. Zacek, diss, 113; Ustroistvo RK Tserkvi, 31. I believe that this principle – authority of one bishop over another – is a violation of Catholic canon (need to double-check).

¹⁴⁸ Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 1098, 1152, 1229, and 1260. [Need language for eastern Siberia].

deciding vote in the case of a tie, "by himself [he] cannot decide any case without the general agreement of the entire College, but [instead] each case will be resolved by a majority of votes."¹⁴⁹ The Islamic muftis and the Karaite hakham were also surrounded by collegial bodies without which they could not issue definitive rulings.¹⁵⁰ Indeed, as if to confirm the collegial principle, the imperial government decreed in 1832 that the power to issue a *fatwa*, granted a year earlier to the Tauride mufti exclusively by the statute, now became dependent on the Spiritual Board's collective resolution.¹⁵¹ For the Armenian confession a similar function was to be performed by the Echmiadzin Synod, originally created, it seems, as a consultative organ in 1802.¹⁵² But whereas the 1836 statute authorized an explicitly collegial order and thus enhanced the powers of the Synod, Bludov remained mindful that the prestige of the Catholicos – especially abroad – could be undermined by encroachment on his historical rights. He emphasized in 1836 that the Synod "is established in the form of a council of the Patriarch" that lacked "a decisive voice" in the resolution of what the statute labeled "purely spiritual affairs." These remained the exclusive prerogative of the Catholicos. In no case were the contradictions between monocratic and collegial rule more pronounced than in this one,¹⁵³ and there is evidence that both Catholicoi themselves and many other Armenians regarded even this rather restricted Synod as a significant, even uncanonical, intrusion on patriarchal power.¹⁵⁴

¹⁴⁹ PSZ-I-VOL-20053, 826; *Svod zakonov* 11-1 (1857): 67-69.

¹⁵⁰ Those bodies were the Tauride Muslim Spiritual Board in Simferopol', the Tauride Karaite Spiritual Board in Evpatoriia, and the Muslim Spiritual Assembly in Ufa. See "Polozhenie" in Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia," 347 (secs. 50-55); *Svod zakonov* 11-1 (1857): 1128-1133; 1235, 1241. the vote of the muftis and the hakham were decisive, however, in the case of ties.

¹⁵¹ For the original arrangement, see "Polozhenie" in Aleksandrov, "K istorii uchrezhdeniia," 343 (sec. 15). For the altered version, see *Svod zakonov* 11-1 (1857.): 1152 and 1217, based on PSZ-II-7-5500 (14.07.1832): 498-505. Laws on the Orenburg mufti likewise stated that his "personal decisions" (i.e., without partition of the Assembly) lacked the status of judicial verdicts and should not be executed. See *Svod art.* 1243.

¹⁵² The precise origins of the Armenian Synod are unclear (some sources date its appearance to 1807), but it seems to have been created by Catholicos Daniil as collegial replacement to the Patriarch's namestnik. See RGADA 1274-1-723 [get other sources]. RGIA 821-7-175, l. 11.

¹⁵³ In fact, the statute itself was self-contradictory. On the one hand, it explicitly gave the Synod the power to decide "conclusively all affairs concerning dogmas of the faith, the conduct of religious services, church rituals, marriages, and those crimes that are not subject to secular courts." On the other hand, it remarked that "in all purely spiritual affairs the Patriarch has a decisive voice," and that the Synod could not resolve such questions even in the Patriarch's absence (for example, the period of time between the death of one Patriarch and the anointment of another). See *Svod zakonov* 11-1 (1857): 940, 943-45.

¹⁵⁴ For Bludov's take, see RGADA 1274-1-723, l. 8; RGIA 821-7-1, ll. 316, 320. For accounts critical of the Synod, see Vartanian, *Armiano-grigorianskaia tserkov'*, 30-31. Even Armenians in India protested against the new powers invested in the Synod. Their complaint is in SSTsSA 7-1-889, ll. 26ob.-27ob. On the tendency of Catholicoi to ignore the Synod: SFIV 58-1-8, [get listy]; RGIA 821-7-175, ll. 31, 40-40ob., 64.

In some cases, however, the tensions between monocratic and collegial authority were far less pronounced. On the one hand, Protestantism and Judaism each lacked a monocratic "spiritual head," and the collegial principle was therefore dominant in the Rabbinical Commission and in the Lutheran General Consistory.¹⁵⁵ Indeed, in the latter institution, and in consistories on the local level, chairmen were specifically laymen, while pastors could rise only to the level of vice-chairman.¹⁵⁶ The chairman of the Rabbinical Commission, meanwhile, was ideally to serve in that capacity for only one year – hardly an arrangement conducive to the accumulation of great religious authority – and neither he nor other members of the commission were required to be rabbis.¹⁵⁷ On the other hand, the monocratic principle was predominant in the case of Buddhism. True, the state initially established a "Lamaist Spiritual Board" to share power with a Lama over Kalmyks in 1834, but a new statute then eliminated that institution in 1847, proclaiming the senior Lama simply to be "supreme spiritual figure among Kalmyks."¹⁵⁸ In Eastern Siberia officials elevated one figure to the status of Bandido-Khambo-Lama, with comparatively few institutional constraints. Indeed, some commentators claimed that this figure had authority vastly superceding that enjoyed by comparable figures in Tibet and Mongolia.¹⁵⁹

Collegial bodies were designed to restrain monocratic authority by empowering religious servitors to deploy the canon and traditions of their own faiths against the abuses and usurpations of "spiritual heads." Procurators, by contrast, were intended to control the actions of both collegial bodies and spiritual heads by using the laws of the state. When some Lutherans opposed the idea of a procurator as an inappropriate restriction on the General Consistory, state officials insisted that procuratorial oversight was already a firmly established principle for Orthodoxy – the predominant faith – and was crucial to preventing the emergence of "a state within a state." The General Consistory accordingly had a procurator, while secretaries seem to have played a similar role in local consistories.¹⁶⁰ For Roman Catholicism and the Armenian confession, procurators were the only figures in the College and Echmiadzin Synod specifically enjoined to

¹⁵⁵ PSZ-II-23-22276 (24.06.1848): 1346-47; Freeze, Jewish Marriage, 83-87.

¹⁵⁶ Get articles. and double check. What is situation for Calvinist College?

¹⁵⁷ Freeze, Jewish Marriage, 248.

¹⁵⁸ RGIA 821-8-1221, ll. 1-8ob.; Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 1260 and 1263; Vashkevich, Lamaity, 61. [I need to see if I can find the reasons for this].

¹⁵⁹ On the extraordinary power of the Bandido-Khambo-lama, see Institut Bandita-Khambo-Lama, esp. 1-2, 9-10.

¹⁶⁰ The cited expression belongs to Turgenev, in GARF 1094-2-8, ll. 4-4ob., 6ob.-7 (citation). The comparison with Orthodoxy is in RGADA 1274-1-527, ll. 53ob.-54. Opposition to procurators is described in RGADA 1274-1-698, l. 6. Legal provisions are in Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 440 and 456. The duties are not well defined here, though. [Check for more refs.]

guarantee the proper application of imperial law.¹⁶¹ The Muslim and Karaite boards did not have procurators as such, but it seems that secretaries played a similar function, at least in the case of Crimean Muslims.¹⁶² The Rabbinical Commission met in St. Petersburg and was under the direct oversight of the interior ministry, which performed the procuratorial function directly.¹⁶³ Buddhist institutions had no procurators as such [double-check], but this function was apparently fulfilled by the Astrakhan' chambers of state properties (among Kalmyks) and the Governor-General of Eastern Siberia (among Buriats).¹⁶⁴

Nor was the work of procurators easy. The first non-Catholic procurator of the Catholic College, appointed in 1836, remarked that his Catholic predecessors had audaciously disregarded the directives of the interior minister and Senate, "with contempt for its rights and powers." The new procurator was an outsider from the start, placed among officials who were enlightened and educated, "but captivated by particular religious feelings and having a particular view on the order of things. Great care is required in order to moderate those feelings and to direct the minds [of the College's staff] towards unity in the system of state administration and towards the general and always beneficial intentions of the government." By his own account he fought a constant battle to prevent his colleagues from privileging canon over state law, from granting bishops excessive freedom, and from making entirely improper demands of their superiors at the interior ministry. In some cases his colleagues even invoked canon as a basis for defying injunctions of the sovereign himself. Nor was his task simplified by the dearth of legislation regulating the Catholic clergy.¹⁶⁵ Similarly, procurators in Echmiadzin encountered great difficulties from Catholicoi, especially Nerses Ashtaraketsi (1843-57), who often ignored the Synod and did not even bother to fill vacancies in it.¹⁶⁶ To judge by available sources, procuratorial oversight often left much to be desired in actual fact.

¹⁶¹ RGIA 821-125-41, ll. 12ob.-13ob.; RGADA 1274-1-723, l. 8; RGIA 821-7-1, l. 320; Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 73, 948;

¹⁶² Art. 92 of the "Polozhenie" (in Aleksandrov, 351). Svoz zakonov provides no description of the duties of the secretary of the Orenburg Assembly (see art. 1235). The interior ministry proposed the appointment of a "Russian procurator" to the Orenburg Assembly in 1868, but nothing came of this initiative. See Arapov, Sistema, 121.

¹⁶³ PSZ-II-23-22276 (24.06.1848); Freeze, Jewish Marriage, 85-86.

¹⁶⁴ Svod zakonov, art. 1271; RGIA 821-150-423 (art. 5 of the statute of 1853). Kalmyks were generally under the administration of the ministry of state properties. RGIA

¹⁶⁵ RGADA 1274-1-595, ll. 3-12 (citations at ll. 3 and 12). The procurator was A. Glagolev, who had declined the position several times before accepting it, knowing full well the difficulties of the job.

¹⁶⁶ These difficulties are described in AVSFIV 58-1-81, [need to review this file more carefully].

The final instrument in limiting religious authority – whether monocratic or collegial – was the appeals process. This issue was crucial in the preparation of the Protestant statute, and several drafts were severely criticized by state officials for not including mechanisms for reversing of the Consistory's rulings.¹⁶⁷ By most of the statutes produced thereafter, complaints against the rulings of established religious institutions could be directed through a local governor to some higher instance, whether the Senate, the Department of Foreign Confessions, or the Emperor.¹⁶⁸ In some cases believers could also appeal the ruling of local clergy on certain matters – for example, property – by bringing cases to regular civil courts.¹⁶⁹ Taking on this appeals function compelled the state to acquire knowledge independent of the religious elites whom it sought to oversee. By mid-century the government had identified a number of figures – most notably Mirza Alexander Kazem-Bek – who had studied in new institutions of Oriental studies and claimed a mastery of Islamic texts superior to that of the ulema. Iakov Brafman seems to have played a similar role in the case of Judaism. (Both of these men were notably converts to Christianity.)¹⁷⁰ By establishing itself as the ultimate appeals instance for some religions, the state in effect defined itself as the ultimate arbiter.

The appeals mechanism, however, looked rather different in the case of those religions with clearly established hierarchies. The Concordat of 1847 restored most of the canonical powers of individual bishops and accordingly reduced the significance of the College. State law therefore recognized that questions exceeding the authority of individual bishops should be directed to Rome.¹⁷¹ I know of no concrete mechanism by which individual believers could appeal the decisions of bishops to either the College or any other state institution.¹⁷² A similar situation pertained for the Armenian confession, in light of the substantial powers of the Catholicos.¹⁷³ The procurator at Echmiadzin and other Armenians could – and did – complain about the "despotism" of Catholicos Nerses and other problems in the church, but there was no legal basis for the state to override the Patriarch's resolution, and the rest of the nineteenth century in fact demonstrated how little success Russia actually had in domesticating the

¹⁶⁷ RGADA 1274-1-527, l. 54; GARF 1094-2-8, ll. 6ob.-7;

¹⁶⁸ "Polozhenie," secs. 2-3 (p. 342); Svod zakonov 11-1 (1857): 1132-33, 1239.

¹⁶⁹ "Polozhenie," sec. 5 (342).

¹⁷⁰ Crews, For Prophet and Tsar, 177-89; Dolbilov, "Russifying Bureaucracy," 128-31. More on Brafman?

¹⁷¹ Svod zakonov, art. 47.

¹⁷² Needs to be double-checked. But I don't see any mechanisms based on what I've seen so far. A petition to the sovereign was always a possible recourse in an autocracy.

¹⁷³ Close reading of Polozhenie of 1836 required to confirm this. Arguing absence is hard!

Catholicos.¹⁷⁴ In short, once St. Petersburg officially recognized a supreme, ecumenical "spiritual head" with authority rooted in sources other than state law, it could not really claim to have appellate powers over it. Though open to denunciations of clerical abuse in the case of Catholics and Armenians, the government made no effort to claim superior knowledge or the status of ultimate arbiter of those religions.

[Here will be 1-2 paragraphs on the tensions between elective and appointive principles in the selection of senior religious servitors.¹⁷⁵ But at this point I'm even more tired than the reader is.]

Conclusion

By 1857 most of the foreign confessions had been outfitted with institutions created and/or legitimized by the imperial state, and their religious provisions had been brought into conformity with the state's interests through the publication of discrete statutes. Similarly, a single state entity, founded as the Central Directorate in 1810, had been granted the power to "direct" the clergies of all the foreign confessions and "to designate the necessary boundaries of freedom in each person's exercise of his faith."¹⁷⁶ In finalizing this order, the imperial government sought to give proper place to "ancient laws, customs, and traditions," while asserting the precedence of imperial law and autocratic privilege. It erected robust instruments of collegial rule, while preserving (or creating) a degree of monocratic authority for most faiths. It granted substantial elements of autonomy to each clergy, while also asserting the prerogative to "direct" their affairs and establishing both an appeals process and procuratorial oversight. Finally, it favored centralization, while also making substantial allowances for ethnic, geographical, and sectarian distinctions. The balance of these different principles, as well as the degree of regulation more generally, varied considerably from case to case, depending on a range of factors specific to each religious tradition. On the whole the arrangement for each religion was exceptional in some respects, but quite typical in most others. In other words, a reasonably coherent system had been constructed for the foreign confessions, with considerable allowances made for the peculiarities of each of them. While still lexically "foreign" and though demonstrably segregated from

¹⁷⁴ On complaints, see SFIV, f. 58, op. 1, d. 81; SVIF, f. 58, op. 1, d. 223; RGIA, f. 821, op. 7. 31.

¹⁷⁵ Note that BXL is no longer elective as of 1853 (Hundley, 156); Babich dynasty monopolizes position of hakham; manipulation of elections of the Catholicos; erosion of elective principle for Orenburg mufti; etc.

¹⁷⁶ Such were the functions of the Directorate identified by an anonymous reviewer of the Protestant statute in the early 1830s. RGADA, f. 1274, op. 1, d. 527, l. 54ob.

Orthodoxy, the non-Orthodox religions had nonetheless been domesticated in an institutional sense.

Yet this system was still not complete or all-encompassing. The government had no arrangements for its substantial pagan population, which numbered some 100,000 in European Russia alone by the late nineteenth century.¹⁷⁷ Armenian Catholics received only a modicum of formal institutionalization in 1893, and their persistent requests for their own bishop within Russia were consistently rejected. The Anglican Church and its clergy in Russian enjoyed "complete independence" from the state – a condition that officials labeled "extremely abnormal" once Russian subjects began to convert to that confession.¹⁷⁸ But the most striking gap in the system undoubtedly concerned Islam. If Muslims in Crimea received an institutional order defined by a discrete legal enactment in 1831, much larger Muslim populations elsewhere in the empire received nothing comparable until much later, if at all. Shias and Sunnis in the South Caucasus finally received statutes and institutions in 1872, while the rules for the Orenburg Assembly, writes one historian, "were not a systematic body of laws but were based on enactments issued at various times and not collected until 1857."¹⁷⁹ No religious institution or statute was ever implemented for Central Asia or the North Caucasus.¹⁸⁰ This situation is all the more striking in light of the numerous proposals of the imperial bureaucracy over the course of a century to regulate Muslim affairs in those regions where such an apparatus was lacking.¹⁸¹ Why did nothing come of these initiatives?

The government's response to the 1913 proposal of the Duma deputies presented at the start of this essay provides important clues. Acknowledging that the situation in the North Caucasus "naturally may not be regarded as normal," the interior ministry nonetheless raised a series of arguments against the proposal. The ministry first of all refused to take upon itself the expense of such a religious administration, citing the undesirable precedent that such

¹⁷⁷ Statutes on the affairs of inorodtsy in Siberia included some basic provisions for religious affairs, but the pagans of European Russia, mostly in Ufa province, were not legally classified as inorodtsy. Their religious affairs were accordingly unregulated.

¹⁷⁸ *Svod zakonov*, vol. 11, part 1 (1896), arts. 238-251; RGIA 821-10-113, ll. 4-7; RGIA 821-5-935, ll. 111-124 (citations at l. 118).

¹⁷⁹ Elena Campbell, "The Autocracy and the Muslim Clergy in the Russian Empire (1850s-1917)," *Russian Studies in History* 44.2 (2005): 8-29 (citation at p. 9). The rules regulating Islam in Crimea were much more detailed and comprehensive than those pertaining to Islam in the Volga-Ural region.

¹⁸⁰ On Central Asia, see Daniel Brower, *Turkestan and the Fate of the Russian Empire* (London, 2003). Crews identifies certain patterns of interaction similar to those in Russia proper, but I propose that the different institutional arrangements are nonetheless significant. See *For Tsar and Prophet*, PAGES.

¹⁸¹ These are described by Arapov in *Sistema*.

commitments would set for other religions. More importantly, executing the deputies' proposal would strengthen and enhance Islam in that region. The people in areas heretofore lacking a religious administration would inevitably interpret the creation of a mufti and a collegial board "as the government's recognition of the special significance of Islam in the given locale." To create an administration was, in effect, to declare the region Islamic, an act that was all the more objectionable in light of what the ministry perceived as the "national tint" that the bugbears of pan-Turkism and pan-Islam had recently given to "our Muslims." Thus while there was a certain logic to extending the models constructed in Crimea and the Volga-Ural region to other territories with Muslim populations, it was also true that those orders had appeared "in completely different historical conditions" and were thus of doubtful relevance to more modern times.¹⁸² Such thinking had in fact already begun to appear in official circles in the mid-nineteenth century – ironically just as the system we have described here was being completed.¹⁸³

In the end, we may propose that state initiative in the organization of non-Orthodox religions and in legislative production for their spiritual affairs was appropriate to a specific historical era in Russia. In this era, extending roughly from Catherine II to Nicholas I (1762-1855), rulers applied to their country first the regulatory model of the central European Polizeistaat, then French-style administrative rationalization, and finally the project of rooting contemporary authority in "ancient laws, customs, and traditions" through compilation. It was a time when the state apparatus was sufficiently skeletal that the enlistment of religious servitors in the task of governance was deeply attractive to state elites. And it was a time when the implications of the national idea were not yet apparent, and when there was correspondingly little concern that the integration of dispersed populations through religious institutions might actually facilitate challenges to the empire's unity. Many of these suppositions would be questioned after the mid-nineteenth century, and calls for reform or elimination of the institutions and statutes described above would appear. But it is a testament to the utility of this religious order, and perhaps also to the regime's inability to generate a viable alternative, that these institutions and statutes continued to function with only minor modification until the end of the old regime.

¹⁸² RGIA 1276-9-849, ll. 8-16 (citations at ll. 12ob.1-3). The ministry referred also to its own rejection of a similar proposal on similar grounds in 1890.

¹⁸³ This development is treated elsewhere in my monograph-in-progress.

